THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

# Notes of Recent Exposition

A GREAT many serious readers remember Professor D. M. BAILLIE'S book, 'God was in Christ,' as a landmark in their thinking, and would wholeheartedly applaud Bultmann's assessment of it as 'the most significant book of our time in the field of Christology.' For this reason a far larger number than those who knew him personally, as teacher or friend, felt closely bereaved at the news of his death, and saddened to think that they could not expect to read any further book of his.

It comes, therefore, as a real delight to find that a new book by him, entitled *The Theology of the Sacraments*, has just been published.[1] It consists mainly of five lectures delivered in 1952 at the Presbyterian Theological Seminary, San Anselmo, California, but, for good measure, there are also included a photograph of the author, a pen-picture of him written by his brother, Professor John Baillie, and two articles on 'The Freedom of the Will' and 'Doctrinal Preaching.' Four of the five lectures on the Sacraments deal with the Holy Communion, and one with Baptism. The author recognizes the greatly increased interest in sacramental practice in most branches of the Church to-day, but warns us that at the same time many thoughtful Christians, with deep uneasiness of mind, are asking whether in fact the observance of the Sacraments is an essential part of our Christian faith. 'Why should we have Sacraments at all?' they inquire. 'Why should not intelligent and educated Christians be content with the more reasonable and rational elements in public worship? Why should they perpetuate such non-rational practices as the sprinkling of water on the head of an unconscious child or of the consuming of tiny quantities of bread and wine?'

With such a frank recognition of the present situation, the author faces his task. We find here the same qualities which so impressed readers of his earlier book—a most pleasing clarity of thought, lucidity of expression, and orderliness of presentation. There is a courteous understanding of the real difficulties of people, combined with searching criticism of 'theological jargon' and the use of catchwords and clichés as a substitute for hard thinking. Sanity and good sense and a deeply Christian spirit pervade every page.

We live in a sacramental universe. This world, the handiwork of God, lends itself to sacramental usage. The parables of Jesus are based on the assumption that 'the whole natural world is God's and is fitted to speak to us of Him.' Water, bread and wine, therefore, readily become symbols of spiritual truth, and we men and women, also God's creatures and part of the physical world, require in our religion such a use of material objects and symbolic actions.

The relationship between grace and faith is elucidated. The Sacraments are a means of grace, of God's free, forgiving love and mercy. 'Grace however is not a transmissible substance, but a living personal relationship.' This grace *operates through* human faith, but should not be said to be dependent on it, since 'all is of God,' and 'even the faith by which we accept God's grace is itself the gift of God, that is wrought in us by His grace, and partly *by means of* the Sacraments.'

In the second lecture the author addresses himself not so much to 'honest doubters' as to those unthinking advocates of sacramental practices whose stock phrases, though high-sounding and even fulsome, are not clearly thought out. One such phrase is the affirmation that the Sacraments are 'an extension of the Incarnation' and another is that they are 'eschatological signs.'

St. Paul declares the Church to be the Body of Christ, in the sense that Christ is the Head of the Body. It is, however, a distortion of the original figure of speech to argue from the metaphor that Christ is to be regarded as the soul of this Body. Christ is not incarnate in His Church. The Incarnation did not go on for ever, but came to an end, and since then 'the divine Presence is

[1] Faber and Faber; 16s. net.

with us in a new way through the Holy Spirit working in the Church through the Word and the Sacraments.' If, however, it is an error to speak of the Sacraments as an extension of the Incarnation, it is essential to stress the continuity between the Incarnation and the Sacraments.

Another word which often obscures rather than clarifies thought is ' eschatological.' It is, however, permissible to describe the Sacraments as ' eschatological signs ' in the sense that, besides looking back to the death and resurrection of Christ, they also look forward to the full enjoyment of the Kingdom, ' of which the Holy Spirit given in baptism is an earnest and seal, and whose messianic banquet we rehearse and anticipate in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.'

In the later chapters on the Real Presence and the Eucharistic offering we find a sensitive appreciation of the abiding truths which the Roman Catholic Church seeks to preserve by means of these doctrines, firmly combined with a frank, but not unfriendly, criticism of those emphases which a Protestant must regard as untenable. From the Roman Catholics we learn to approach the Lord's Table looking beyond ourselves to Him ; and though we affirm that the sacrifice of Christ was made on Calvary once for all, and does not need to be repeated, that does not mean that we may not bring to God sacrifices which are acceptable to Him, and bring them to Him in the service of the Eucharist—charity to our brethren, as well as prayers and praises and thanksgivings.

Throughout the book the spirit of reconciliation prevails, and an eager desire to understand those branches of the Church furthest separated from the writer's own. He deplores the power of words to perpetuate and accentuate differences. We must learn to penetrate beneath them to their real meaning, and then we find our differences becoming smaller ; and ' when we penetrate to the real meaning, we come nearer to each other too in our sacramental theology.' By such words as ' altar,' ' mass,' ' sacrifice ' one believer may be meaning the same truths which another has been taught to express by quite other means.

This is not a book to provoke barren arguments, but to awaken a deeper appreciation of the abiding value of the Sacraments and a clearer discernment of their essential meaning.

---

Thinkers who reach optimistic conclusions are not numerous to-day, and their realism is apt to be suspect ; but we wish to introduce one who can present a substantial case for his optimism, which thing he does in a chapter entitled ' The Return of Order ' in a book which he has recently issued.[1] The disappearance of God, he says, has spelt intellectual chaos, and it is therefore a welcome sign that over wide areas of life there is in these days a return to order. May that not foretoken a return to God ? This return to order our author finds in four fields—ecology, science, psychology and history. Let us note some of the signs which he has discerned.

Ecology, which is as much an art as a science, is the study of how to live harmoniously with animals and plants in the same world. It has come to its own but recently ; indeed the very name is not to be found in the older dictionaries. For thousands of years in Western Europe and the Far East the soil has retained its fertility, but this has been so only because, realizing that there are certain laws relating to the soil which cannot be broken with impunity, man has adopted an attitude of understanding and respect towards the earth and has not sought to force it beyond its capacity. In the last generation, however, it has become apparent in widely different parts of the world that fertile lands were becoming deserts. The dust bowls show what happens when the earth is exploited by the greed of man, and they stand as a symbol of the reaction of God's creation upon those who will not recognize it as His. With the decay of belief in God came the decline of respect for the earth. What was it but so much stuff to be grasped and used ? Now men see that that way leads to starvation, and they are hastily trying to repair the damage and restore the balance of Nature. Since man the exploiter has become man the victim he has looked at the earth afresh and found that it has its own pattern of orderliness to which he must conform if he is to continue to find it fruitful. Once you speak of respect for order, however, you are on the way to moral imperatives, and the end of that road is God. The earth has its order ; there are rules to be obeyed. Is it conceivable that there is no Mind responsible for these rules and that order springs from chaos ?

In several spheres of science, too, there is a new interest in the conception of a purposive order in life. Paley's argument from design is discarded, but a similar argument can be stated in vitalistic and teleological terms. How can one explain the forward-looking adaptability of the creature to its environment, for instance the insect which instinctively deposits its eggs in a

[1] *The Signs of Our Times*, by Dr. Maldwyn Edwards (Epworth Press ; 22s. 6d. net).

place which will supply the appropriate nourishment for the coming generation of grubs, though before the eggs are hatched the insect itself will be dead ? The teleological thrust in organic life implies a purpose, and a purpose implies a purposive Mind. Here, be it noted, is no attempt to find God in the gaps left unfilled by science, but rather to see Him as the directive intelligence in all the process.

In psychology, too, the great contributions of the analytical schools of Freud, Adler, and Jung have been assimilated, and there is now a new tendency to recognize that man is not just a bundle of instincts, sentiments and complexes, and a new willingness to see him steadily and see him whole as a self-determining agent, whose mind is not merely the by-product of cerebral forces. This recovery of man's status is aided by a great deal of work that has recently been done in the spheres of telepathy and extra-sensory perception and by the persistent recognition of those gifts of man's mind which find expression in colour, sound, form and the moral judgment. All this points to man as a moral being in a moral order and answerable to a moral God, for if the mind of man is so wonderful, how much greater must be its Source ?

As regards historical study it is now generally admitted that the attempt to make history a science, no less and no more, has failed. The historian may accept and gather his material with scientific impartiality, but, when he comes to assess and arrange the evidence and tries to unify the seemingly intractable elements, he must become in some sense a judge. There his personal standpoint or bias will become apparent—the rationalist bias of Gibbon, the Whig bias of Macaulay, yes, even the North German Protestant bias of von Ranke, despite his purpose of scientific disinterestedness. The significant thing in recent historical study is not the particular conclusions of the historians but the standpoint they have come to adopt. Lord Acton, with his ethical outlook, is once more becoming a name to conjure with, witness both Toynbee and Butterfield who find history susceptible of moral meaning.

The return to an idea of order in those four branches of knowledge which concern the earth and its people is in effect a return to God, for must there not be one Mind, rational and moral, to make such an earth and such men upon it ? Rid yourself of God and you rid yourself of order. The world becomes an accident, morality a social convention, history a relentless struggle for power. Reverse the movement, however, return again to reason and order in life and the revival in religion has begun. Thus, on our author's showing, the revival of religion is not to be deduced from the success of evangelistic campaigns, and it is not to be denied because the mass of the people remain as unmoved as before. Its beginning is to be found in the turning from that disbelief which bowed God out of His universe and allowed man to sit upon the throne. ' Past experience suggests that it will be a generation before the fullest effects of the present return to order are experienced, but the direction is right, and the road is the King's highway. He that hath eyes to see—let him see.'

# The Concept of 'Faith' in the Synoptic Gospels

By the Reverend Thomas Shearer, B.D., B.Litt., Orwell

Like the rest of the New Testament,[1] the Synoptic Gospels refer to ' faith,' ' unbelief,' etc. (*πίστις* and its derivatives—*πιστεύω*, *ἀπιστία*, *κ.τ.λ.*) in various senses. I have analysed these, and find the analysis throwing light on some aspects of the origins of the New Testament and the Christian Church. The references [2] may be classified into three groups : (1) those in which ' faith ' means ' accepting statements or facts as true ' ; (2) those in which the predominant ideas are of trust and/or expectation ; (3) those where the context does not make the meaning clear. This classification no doubt ignores numerous shades of meaning ; but for our present purpose it is sufficient.

Of the meaning ' acceptance as true,' if duplicated passages are reckoned as one, the Synoptics have twelve clear cases. Four of these are in Mk $16^{9-20}$ : the apostles *disbelieved* two reports of the Resurrection (Mk $16^{11.\ 13}$), and were therefore

[1] Cf. The Expository Times, lxviii. [Jan., Feb., Apr., 1957] 111, 157, 221.

[2] For convenience' sake I have used the text in Huck-Lietzmann-Cross's *Synopsis of the First Three Gospels* (Eng. ed. [Tübingen, 1936]).

rebuked by Jesus for their *unbelief* (ἀπιστίαν), because they *did not believe* (οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν) what they were told (Mk 16[14]). 'Lack of faith' here means failure to accept *statements* as true. Mark has only one other clear case of 'faith' in this sense—Mk 13[21] (=Mt 24[23]), where Jesus warns His disciples *not to believe* (μὴ πιστεύετε) stories of His re-appearance. In Mt 24[26] Jesus gives a similar warning.

In Luke 'faith' occurs in this sense six times. Gabriel rebukes Zacharias because he *did not believe* the archangel's *words* (Lk 1[20]). Elisabeth greets Mary as *one who has believed* (πιστεύσασα) Gabriel's *statement* (Lk 1[45]). Jesus at His trial says, 'If I *tell* you, ye *will not believe*' (Lk 22[67]). The apostles *disbelieved* (ἠπίστουν) the *words* of the women who first reported the Resurrection (Lk 24[11]). Jesus calls the disciples on the road to Emmaus 'slow of heart to *believe* all that the prophets have *spoken*' (Lk 24[25]). All these refer to the acceptance or rejection of *words*. The sixth example—the *unbelief* of the apostles at the sight of the Risen Christ (Lk 24[41])—means presumably that they could not *accept the fact* that the person standing before them was really Jesus.

Much commoner are references to *faith* in a *person*, where 'faith' means 'trust and/or expectation.' Thus, the adjective πιστός clearly implies *trust*; and, in so far as one *expects* much of a person whom one *trusts*, the idea of *expectation* is probably also present. The meaning is well brought out in Lk 16[10-12], where Jesus uses πιστός four times, contrasting it with ἀδικός ('unrighteous') and linking it with πιστεύειν in the sense of 'entrust' (with dative of person and accusative of thing, the only such use of πιστεύειν in the Synoptics). This conjunction of words makes it clear that πιστός means 'faithful' in the sense of 'trustworthy.' The meaning is the same in Mt 24[45] (=Lk 12[42]), where Jesus speaks of a 'faithful slave,' and in the Parables of the Talents and the Pounds, where Jesus again calls servants 'faithful' (Mt 25[21. 23]), and assigns them a reward because they have been 'faithful in a few things' or 'in the least' (Mt 25[21. 23], Lk 19[17]).

Another compound is ὀλιγόπιστος ('of little faith'). Jesus calls His disciples ὀλιγόπιστοι for worrying about the future (Mt 6[30]=Lk 12[28]), and for their fear before the stilling of the storm (Mt 8[26], paraphrased in Mk 4[40] and Lk 8[25]). He addresses Peter as ὀλιγόπιστε after his failure to walk upon the water (Mt 14[31]). He says the apostles failed to heal a boy 'because of their *little faith* (ὀλιγοπιστίαν)' (Mt 17[20]). All these obviously imply that the disciples had not *trusted* God enough or *expected* enough from Him. In Mt 16[8] Jesus calls the disciples ὀλιγόπιστοι because they thought His reference to leaven was due to their failure to carry bread. The connexion here is not obvious; but in the following verses Jesus seems to be trying to arouse His followers' *trust* by reminding them of the Feedings of the Five Thousand and of the Four Thousand; which suggests that ὀλιγόπιστοι here, too, may have the usual meaning. In any case it has nothing to do with 'accepting facts.'

A phrase that occurs several times in the Gospels is 'Thy *faith* hath saved thee (ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε).' Jesus says it to Bartimaeus (Mk 10[52]=Lk 18[42]) and to the woman with the issue of blood (Mt 9[22]=Mk 5[34]=Lk 8[48]), both of whom by their persistence in face of difficulties had proved their complete *trust* in Jesus and *expectation* of help from Him. The other two people to whom He addressed it were the woman who washed Jesus' feet with her tears (Lk 7[50]) and the grateful leper (Lk 17[19]). Both were rather expressing gratitude for past favours than expectation of future benefits; but in both cases the πίστις is a personal relationship, not inappropriately described as *trust*.

In several other passages Jesus declares that 'faith as a grain of mustard seed' is a source of power, enough to remove mountains or trees (Mt 17[20]: Mt 21[21]=Mk 11[22. 23]—two references: Lk 17[5-6]). 'Faith' here again means an *expectation* of results and a *trust* in the God who gives them. (Lk 17[5-6] begins with the apostles' request, 'Increase our faith'; but this merely introduces, and derives its meaning from, Jesus' reply.)

Stories of healing provide further references. Jesus speaks of 'faith' in connexion with the centurion's servant (Mt 8[10]=Lk 7[9], Mt 8[13]), the Syrophenician woman (Mt 15[28]), Jaïrus' daughter (Mk 5[36]=Lk 8[50]), and the epileptic boy (Mk 9[23]). In two other verses the references are not ascribed to Jesus; but in one of these (Mk 9[24]) the epileptic's father uses πιστεύω and ἀπιστίαν as a mere echo of Jesus' πιστεύοντι. The other is the Evangelists' comment on the four friends of the paralytic ('and Jesus seeing their *faith*'—Mt 9[2]=Mk 2[5]=Lk 5[20]). This implies a knowledge of Jesus' mind that could only have been learned from Himself; and therefore, though these words are not ascribed to Him, He may have spoken them, either on this occasion or when telling the story later. However that may be, the connexion with healing in all these references makes their meaning clear. The centurion had 'faith' because he *trusted* Jesus and *expected* more than others did. The four friends and the Syrophenician woman (like Bartimæus and the woman with the issue of blood) showed their trust and expectation by persistence. Jaïrus and the father of the epileptic boy are told to 'believe,' the context offering no statements for their acceptance, but implying *trust* in Jesus and *expectation* of His help.

In three passages I have no doubt that the basic meaning is 'trust and expectation'; but two of these certainly and the third possibly exemplify the transition between this sense and 'acceptance.' In Mt $9^{28-29}$ Jesus says to two blind men, '*Do you believe that* (πιστεύετε ὅτι) I can do this? . . . According to your *faith* (πίστιν) let it happen to you.' In Mk $11^{24}$ (=Mt $21^{22}$) He says to His disciples, 'Whatsoever things you pray for, . . . *believe that* (πιστεύετε ὅτι) you have received them, and they will be yours.' In both these cases the 'belief' is *trust* in God and *expectation* of His gifts; but πιστεύειν with a subordinate clause would suggest 'acceptance as true' if the context allowed it. (Mt $21^{22}$ reads less unexpectedly πιστεύοντες λήμψεσθε—'*believing* ye shall receive.') In the third case, the people of Nazareth through over-familiarity were blind to Jesus' greatness—they neither *trusted* Him to lead them nor *expected* anything from Him. This was their ἀπιστία ('lack of faith') (Mt $13^{58}$=Mk $6^{6}$); but 'refusal to accept the truth that He was Christ' may also be implied. This last is one of the few narrative passages in the Gospels referring to 'faith'; but it is possible that it conceals a saying of Jesus. Mark's comment, 'he marvelled because of their ἀπιστίαν' (Mk $6^{6}$), reads almost like a summary of a speech; and it is difficult to say how otherwise the narrator could know what was in Jesus' mind.

There remain a number of passages where the context is indecisive. Three of these, all in Luke, are especially indefinite—Jesus' question whether at His second coming He shall find *faith* upon the earth (Lk $18^{8}$); His words to Peter at the Last Supper, 'I have prayed for thee, that thy *faith* fail not' (Lk $22^{32}$); and the explanation of the Parable of the Sower (Lk $8^{13}$), where Jesus compares the seed cast on a rock to those who *believe for a time* (πρὸς καιρὸν πιστεύουσιν, without an object). In these places the context gives no help at all.

No others are quite so vague. In two doubtful places 'faith' probably means 'acceptance as true.' Mk $16^{16-17}$, where Jesus' words πιστεύσας, ἀπιστήσας and πιστεύσασιν are undefined, is unlikely to have intended 'faith' in a different sense from Mk $16^{11.\ 13.\ 14}$. Less certain is Mk $1^{15}$, where Jesus' preaching is summarized as 'Repent ye, and *believe the gospel* (πιστεύετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ).' This might mean, 'Trust in God and His promises'; but since εὐαγγέλιον means etymologically 'good news,' and news consists of words, 'Believe that My words are true' seems a more natural interpretation. (The parallel passages, Mt $4^{17}$ and Lk $4^{15}$, omit πιστεύετε κ.τ.λ.)

Elsewhere the meaning 'trust-expectation' seems more likely. One case (ὀλιγόπιστοι in Mt $16^{8}$) has been discussed already. In another (Mt $23^{23}$), where Jesus accuses the Pharisees of neglecting 'judgment, mercy, and *faith*,' πίστιν is undefined, and is omitted from the Lucan parallel (Lk $11^{42}$); but the nature of 'judgment' and 'mercy' suggests that the meaning of 'faith' here may be 'trustworthiness' rather than 'belief.' There is a similar slight ambiguity in several passages which speak of *believing in a person*. The verb πιστεύειν is used of *believing* in John the Baptist by the scribes and Pharisees in Mt $21^{25}$ (=Mk $11^{31}$=Lk $20^{5}$), and thrice by Jesus in Mt $21^{32}$. In Mk $9^{42}$ Jesus uses πιστεύειν without an object,[1] and therefore without indicating whether He means belief in words or in a person; but the parallel passage (Mt $18^{6}$) adds εἰς ἐμέ ('in me'). Similarly in Mk $15^{32}$ Jesus' enemies urge Him to come down from the Cross 'that we may *believe*' (πιστεύσωμεν without object): to this Mt $27^{42}$ adds ἐπ' αὐτόν ('in Him'). 'Belief in a person' usually means '*trust* in him' or '*expecting much* of him'; but it could mean 'believing his words' or 'accepting his claims.'

We find, then, that, if we reckon two or more parallel passages as one, there are in the Synoptic Gospels twelve examples of 'faith' in the sense of 'acceptance as true,' thirty-five (including the 'transition' cases) where the meaning is demonstrably 'trust-expectation,' and fifteen where the sense cannot be determined with certainty. Of the fifteen doubtful cases only four (three of them in Mk $16^{9-20}$) mean probably 'acceptance as true,' and eight are more likely to mean 'trust-expectation,' the remaining three being quite ambiguous. Six references to 'faith' occur in narrative passages (Mt $9^{2}$=Mk $2^{5}$=Lk $5^{20}$, Mt $13^{58}$=Mk $6^{6}$, Mk $16^{11.13}$, Lk $24^{11.\ 41}$), forty-nine are ascribed to Jesus, and seven to other speakers. Of the references not ascribed to Jesus, two (Mt $9^{2}$=Mk $2^{5}$=Lk $5^{20}$, Mt $13^{58}$=Mk $6^{6}$) may nevertheless derive from Him, and three others (Mk $9^{24}$—two references, Lk $17^{5}$) are so closely connected with Jesus' words that they can scarcely be regarded as independent. Of the four remaining sayings ascribed to others, two (Mt $21^{25}$=Mk $11^{31}$=Lk $20^{5}$, Mt $27^{42}$=Mk $15^{32}$) probably imply 'trust-expectation,' and two (Lk $1^{20.\ 45}$) have the meaning 'acceptance,' which is also to be understood in two narrative passages in Luke (Lk $24^{11.\ 41}$). Of the seven derivatives of πίστις in Mk $16^{9-20}$ (an unusually large number for so short a passage) five are ascribed to Jesus and two are in the writer's narrative: all seven seem to mean 'acceptance as true.' This meaning appears in only five other sayings ascribed to Jesus. Of these one (Mk $1^{15}$) is a mere summary of Jesus' preaching, and need not represent His own use of the word. Two others (Mt $24^{23}$=Mk $13^{21}$, Mt $24^{26}$) are in chapters whose authenticity has been doubted

[1] *I.e.*, in Huck's text.

on other grounds. The remaining two (Lk $22^{67}$ and Lk $24^{25}$) are unconfirmed by Matthew and Mark and may perhaps be due to the Evangelist's 'editing' of his materials.[1] Most references therefore are ascribed to Jesus, and most have the meaning 'trust-expectation.'

The full significance of these results can be appreciated only after considering certain other problems, such as the dating of the Gospels, the connexion of πίστις with Hebrew אמת, or the use of πίστις in the Septuagint, in other parts of the New Testament, and in later Christian writing—all of which would take us too far afield at present. But some things can be said even now, if only tentatively.

The first is that, in its use of derivatives of πίστις, Mk $16^{9-20}$ differs so widely from the rest of Mark as to suggest a different author. This tends to confirm the usual opinion that Mk $16^{9-20}$ is a late addition to the text.

Elsewhere in the Synoptics most instances of πίστις in the sense of 'acceptance' occur in those parts of Luke that are derived from neither Q nor Mark; which, combined with the evidence of Mk $16^{9-20}$, suggests that 'acceptance as true' is a later meaning than 'trust-expectation.' This might help in dating other parts of the New Testament. For example, the meaning of πίστις in Ja $2^{14-26}$ is clearly 'acceptance as true'—a possible argument against an early date for this Epistle.

Thirdly, the Synoptic record of Jesus' teaching seems to be less different than some have imagined from the teaching of Paul. Paul is not alone in emphasizing 'faith.' The Synoptics contain numerous references to 'faith,' the great majority of these references are ascribed to Jesus, and He is represented as using πίστις in a sense similar to Paul's.[2] The idea of a great gulf between Jesus and Paul dies hard, though it is perhaps less common than it once was. There seems now less reason for it than ever.

Nor is it likely that the emphasis on 'faith' was due to Paul or someone else and inserted into the Gospels without any basis in Jesus' teaching. The Evangelists themselves can hardly have done this. They show no great interest in emphasizing 'faith,' seldom speaking of it except in quotation. Where they do, it is in passages apparently derived from their less authentic sources, and not with the Pauline meaning. Mk $16^{9-20}$ certainly understood 'faith' in the sense of 'accepting as true'; and there is some evidence that Luke did too—perhaps also Mark, if Mk $1^{15}$ is his own interpretation of Jesus' preaching. They show no awareness that Jesus' meaning was different; yet they consistently report Him as using 'faith' in the sense of 'trust-expectation.' So the Evangelists did not falsify in the interests of their own views—they seem even to have quoted sayings in conflict with their views; and they report Jesus' meaning with a consistency which, being apparently unconscious, cannot be due to their own alterations, but must have been found in their sources. But these sources are not likely to have been falsified either; for their interpretation of πίστις seems to be the earlier and therefore more probably the original one, and they must have arisen too soon to learn this meaning from Paul. Moreover, the consistency of Jesus' use of 'faith' suggests a master's grasp of His subject; whereas here and there in Paul's writings I seem to detect the kind of slight momentary confusion[3] that might be expected in an able disciple. All this suggests that, whatever may be thought of individual sayings, the Synoptic Gospels as a whole do preserve a reliable tradition; that Jesus did emphasize 'faith' in the sense of 'trust-expectation'; and that when Paul preached 'salvation through faith' he was only echoing the teaching of his Master.

---

[1] There is some evidence that Luke here and there, quite innocently and without intending to alter the meaning, made verbal changes in his sources with a view to improving their literary quality: *e.g.*, Lk $5^{14}$ (=Mt $8^{4}$=Mk $1^{44}$), where Luke substitutes παρήγγειλεν for the simple λέγει of Matthew and Mark: Lk $12^{42}$ (=Mt $24^{45}$), where Luke has οἰκονόμος for Matthew's δοῦλος.

[2] I believe a detailed examination of Paul's use of πίστις would show that his predominant meaning is approximately the same as that of Jesus, though space forbids demonstration of this here.

[3] *E.g.*, does 'faith' in Ro $5^{2}$ mean the same as in Ro $4^{5}$, and was Paul aware of the difference?

# The Saying of Jesus About the Bridge[1]

By the Reverend Professor Joachim Jeremias, D.D., Göttingen

In the year 1900 the following notice appeared in The Expository Times (xi. [1899–1900] 507) :

'An Agraphon. The Secret of the Presence.

'There is in Northern India a spacious city, built by a Mogul emperor, for his own glory, Futtypore Sikri. It is absolutely deserted now by man. Over a vast gateway in the silent walls is carved an Arabic inscription, which purports to preserve, strange to say, an ἄγραφον, an extra-scriptural utterance of our blessed Lord's: "Jesus, on whom be peace, hath said, This world is but a bridge; pass over; but build not thy dwelling there." H. C. G. Moule.'

Although archaeologists were already aware of the existence of the inscription, yet, so far as I know, the notice in The Expository Times was the first intimation which the theological world received of the amazing fact that a lost saying of the Lord was to be found in an Arabic inscription in a ruined city in North India. The information attracted considerable attention, but, strangely enough, it was almost entirely confined to devotional literature. Scholarship was confronted by a riddle. V. A. Smith's pronouncement in 1917, 'The source of the saying attributed to Jesus has not been discovered,' continued to hold good during the following decades. Only very recently has it become possible to throw a little light on the obscurity which enshrouds the history of the transmission of this saying of Jesus.[2] I shall give an account of these studies later on; but first let us return to the lost saying of the Lord. Literally translated the Arabic text of the inscription runs: 'Jesus, on whom be peace, has said: The world is a bridge. Pass over it, but do not make your abode upon it.'

## I

The ruined city of Fathpur Sikri, where the inscription was discovered, lies a hundred and ten miles south of Delhi, and is a brilliant example of Mogul architecture in the sixteenth century. Until 1569 Sikri was an insignificant village; but in that year the Grand Mogul Akbar, Emperor of India, who had ascended the throne in 1556 at the age of thirteen, and was then twenty-six years old, chose the small village as his residence, and began to transform it into a magnificent city. Sikri then received the name which it still bears, Fathpur Sikri, the City of Victory.

The Grand Mogul only lived in Fathpur Sikri until 1585; but in 1601, four years before his death, he once more made a triumphal entry into his former capital. As a memorial of that day he caused an Arabic inscription to be engraved on the southern main gate of the great mosque of Fathpur Sikri. After a statement of the occasion for the inscription and the date, came the saying of Jesus about the bridge. The inscription is repeated on a second place in the same mosque, namely, over the arcade of the northern wing of the main building; it was engraved on the same date and on the same occasion. Its repetition shows that the saying had a deep significance for Akbar. The question arises whether we can gain some light on the previous history of the saying by turning our attention to the personality of the Grand Mogul.

Akbar, who lived from 1542 to 1605, was an unusual character. Although he was an Oriental despot, filled with a lust for power and a boundless ambition, he was at the same time tolerant in religious matters, mystically inclined, and a sincere seeker after truth. Orthodox Muhammadan though he was, he was continually obsessed with the problem of how to unite an India torn asunder by religious divisions. With this end in view he made a serious study of Hinduism, Parseeism, and Jainism; he also turned his attention to Christianity. He had heard that on the distant western coast of India there were Portuguese Jesuit missionaries in Goa. Accordingly, in December 1578, he sent a mission to Goa, requesting the Portuguese to send two scholars to Fathpur Sikri, bringing with them the books of the Law, but especially the Gospels. It may be imagined how thrilled the Portuguese missionaries were to receive this unexpected request from the Emperor of India. It seemed to disclose a vista of undreamed-of possibilities. But these soaring expectations were doomed to disappointment; Akbar did not become a Christian. On the

[1] An English translation of Professor Jeremias' *Unbekannte Jesusworte*, in which he examines in detail twenty-one 'lost sayings,' is to be published on 14th October by the S.P.C.K. under the title, *Unknown Sayings of Jesus*, price 10s. A review will appear soon.

[2] J. Jeremias, 'Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte des Agraphon "Die Welt ist eine Brücke,"' *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen*, I. Phil.-Hist. Klasse, 1953, Nr. 4.

contrary, in 1582 he proclaimed a rationalistic monotheism which should effect the religious unification of India, with himself as the prophet and vicegerent of God on earth. With Akbar's death in 1605 his new religion which was to have united India came to a sudden end. The question, however, which concerns us is whether it was the Portuguese missionaries who imparted to Akbar the saying of Jesus about the Bridge. The answer can only be a negative one. In 1602 a Jesuit missionary named Jerome Xavier wrote for Akbar a comprehensive life of Jesus which has been preserved for us. It contains many apocryphal traditions about Jesus, but of the saying with which we are concerned not a trace is to be found in the *Historia Christi* of Jerome Xavier.

II

We must, then, pursue a second line of inquiry. When in 1295 Marco Polo returned to Europe from his sojourn of twenty-five years in the Far East, he astonished the West with the news that there were numerous Christians living on the east coast of Southern India who venerated the grave of the Apostle Thomas, and that there were also Christians on the south-west coast of India. This Indian Christianity can be traced back to a very early date. Attributed to the activity of the Apostle Thomas, it can be dated with certainty to shortly after 300 ; Christianity may even have penetrated into the Indo-Afghanistan borderland at the latest soon after 200.

We have then to ask whether it was the early Christian missionaries who brought to India the saying of Jesus which described this world as merely a bridge, a passage from time into eternity. This conjecture, too, must be rejected. It assumes that until its appearance in 1601 the saying had been orally transmitted in India without ever being committed to writing for well over a thousand years, which is highly improbable.

Hence our results so far have been negative ; the assumption that the Agraphon in question reached Northern India through Christian transmission, either in the early period, or in the sixteenth century, has proved to be untenable.

III

We are now, however, in possession of some reliable information. A year ago a Swedish scholar discovered traces of the saying about the Bridge in yet another place, to wit, in Spain.[1]

From 1105 King Alphonso I was reigning in the Kingdom of Aragon, the eastern part of Spain. His personal physician was a Jew named Moses Sephardi, *i.e.*, Moses the Spanish Jew. In 1106 this man embraced Christianity, and at his baptism took the name of Petrus Alphonsi. He chose Alphonsi as his surname because his patron, King Alphonso I of Aragon, had been his godfather. This Petrus Alphonsi wrote several books, among which was one entitled *Disciplina Clericalis*, a collection of stories and proverbs to serve as illustrations for Christian preachers ; in it he provided his Christian readers with examples of Oriental wisdom literature.

At the end of the book (*Exemplum* xxviii.) there are Oriental sayings about the end of life : ' The philosopher says, Work for the world to come as if thou wert about to die. Work for the present world as if thou wouldest live for ever.' Another runs, ' The world is like a bridge, pass over it, but do not settle on it.'

Thus we find our Agraphon also in Spain about 1106. But the riddle only becomes more bewildering : what is the connexion between Northern India and Spain ?

IV

We must once more recall the tenor of the North-Indian inscription, noting especially the wording of its introduction : ' Jesus, upon whom be peace, hath said, The world is a bridge. Pass over it, but do not make your abode upon it.' The expression ' Jesus, upon whom be peace,' is the usual Muhammadan formula introducing a traditional saying of Jesus. This observation points to Arabic literature, and so does Petrus Alphonsi, who drew his proverbs from the East.

The Muhammadans venerate Jesus as a prophet, with the reservation that Muhammad is the greater prophet, and possess a written tradition of numerous sayings of Jesus. Examination of the ancient collections of the sayings of Jesus, for the most part quite worthless, preserved in Muhammadan literature proves disappointing ; they contain no trace of the saying about the Bridge. In the years after the First World War, however, a Madrid Arabic scholar published a collection of the sayings of Jesus preserved in Muhammadan literature which vastly surpassed in comprehensiveness those of his predecessors. Here, to my great astonishment, I found the saying about the Bridge occurring no less than eight times ; moreover, it can at once be shown to be one of the oldest of the Muhammadan sayings of Jesus, for no less than a companion of Muhammad, Ibn Omar, is our informant. This takes the saying about the Bridge back to the seventh century, *i.e.*, about a thousand years earlier than the Indian inscription of 1601. Still more surprising is the fact that this Ibn

[1] H. Sahlin, ' Die Welt ist eine Brücke . . . ', in *ZNTW*, xlvii. [1956], 286f.

Omar would have liked to attribute the saying to Muhammad, but did not succeed in doing so. Muhammadan tradition of the succeeding period almost without exception ascribed the saying to Jesus, as does the Indian inscription of Fathpur Sikri. Since the possibility cannot be admitted that the Muhammadans have transferred an original saying of Muhammad to Jesus, it may be assumed with certainty that the saying has its origin in pre-Muhammadan times.

V

Examination of the Rabbinic literature enables us to trace the saying still further back.

Although the saying about the Bridge is not to be found here, yet it provides us with a saying of a Jewish scholar, Rabbi Ja'qob, who lived about A.D. 200, which exhibits a stylistic structure similar to that of the saying about the Bridge. 'Rabbi Ja'qob,' thus we read in the Mishnah, 'was accustomed to say, This world is like the ante-room to the world to come. Prepare thyself in the ante-room in order that thou mayest be allowed to enter the banqueting hall.'

Here, no doubt, a different metaphor is employed, but the structural resemblance between the two sayings is too striking to be ignored: both begin in the same way, 'The world is like'; in both an imperative follows; both contain the same admonition: to consider the temporary nature of this world; both adjure the hearers to remember that this life is only a transition state.

Hence it is certain that both sayings belong to the same type.

VI

Nevertheless, the extreme antiquity of the saying of Jesus contained in the Indian inscription of 1601 makes it necessary to consider more seriously than has hitherto been done the authenticity of the saying about the Bridge. First we must consider the nature of the metaphor employed; the metaphor of the bridge is ill-suited to a country like Palestine, so poorly supplied with water, yet it would be rash to affirm that such a metaphor could not have been coined in Palestine. The content of the saying, however, is the decisive point. With regard to this, the admonition which it contains is by no means wanting in the sayings of Jesus, namely, the warning to remember the temporary nature of this life—'Thou fool,' says Jesus in the Parable of the Rich Fool, 'this night shall thy soul be required of thee,' and in another place, 'What shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole world and suffer the loss of his soul?'—but in a genuine saying of Jesus we expect to find a reference to the coming Kingdom of God. The absence of any reference to the end, the eschatological note, must be regarded as decisive against the authenticity of our saying.

But even if the saying is not genuine, yet it merits our consideration. The very fact that it has been ascribed to Jesus is a sign of the honour with which it has been regarded. Indeed it might well be maintained that a breath of the spirit of Jesus is discernible in this transference of the saying to Him.

It indicates a consciousness that this was what He meant: that this world is not the end. It is but a transition, a bridge from time into eternity; and further, a consciousness that the admonition, too, 'Pass over, but do not settle there,' is in keeping with His message.

Thus our saying confronts us with the challenge: Are we not continually prone to forget that this world is only a bridge, and that we are only pilgrims and sojourners? Is it not the fundamental defect in our lives that we behave as though our cares, our successes, and our sufferings, were all that is real, and that we give so little consideration to the *Reality of God*? 'Jesus, upon whom be peace, hath said, This world is a bridge. Pass over, but do not make your abode upon it.'

# Literature

## *THE TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT*

Almost all students to-day use Kittel's 'Biblia Hebraica,' of which three editions have been published and a fourth is in preparation. The *apparatus criticus* contains a great many conjectural emendations—a large proportion of which might be dispensed with without loss—together with much valuable information about the readings of MSS. and ancient versions. Not all of this information can be implicitly trusted, though as a desk edition this Bible is indispensable.

Professor E. Würthwein has written a companion handbook to Kittel's Bible, intended to enable students to understand the significance of the material given at its foot, and Dr. P. R. Ackroyd has now translated it into English, under the title *The Text of the Old Testament* (Blackwell; 17s. 6d. net). This work is much more than a companion to Kittel; it is an excellent handbook on

the textual criticism of the Old Testament. Here the student will find up-to-date and trustworthy information about the chief Hebrew manuscripts of the Old Testament, and the varieties of error that have arisen in the course of the transmission of the text. He will find information about the various ancient versions, and their relation to one another, as well as about the major manuscripts in which they are preserved. The principles to be applied in textual reconstruction, and the materials available to help the student, are here indicated. Altogether, this book may be commended without reserve, and students will find it an invaluable *vade mecum*.

In one particular Professor Würthwein's book is not quite reliable, but for this the author is not to be blamed, since his statement accorded with all that was known when he wrote. He refers to the Jerusalem Targum as the Fragment Targum, as all his predecessors had done. Quite recently a complete manuscript of this Targum has been found in the Vatican Library (Neofiti 1), so that it is no longer correct to call it a Fragment Targum. It has not yet been published, though at least one complete photostat has come to this country. Future editions of Dr. Würthwein's book will doubtless make mention of it. The material from the Dead Sea Scrolls so far published is here utilized, though again there are reports of further important finds which will need to be recorded in the next edition.

This handbook is enriched by the inclusion of forty-one excellent Plates, with a description of each, and there is a good bibliography to guide the student who wishes to make a fuller study of the subject. Textual criticism is a vital part of all Biblical study, and Dr. Würthwein is to be thanked for providing this first-class handbook.

H. H. Rowley

---

## *MACCABEES, ZEALOTS AND JOSEPHUS*

Professor W. R. Farmer, of Drew University, has written an excellent study of Josephus's account of the Zealots in the war with the Romans in relation to his account of the Maccabaean wars, under the title of *Maccabees, Zealots and Josephus* (Columbia University Press, New York and Oxford University Press ; 36s. net). His thesis is that the Zealots were the heirs of the Maccabees and their associates, and that there was a continuous line of tradition linking the two, despite the fact that Josephus depicts the Maccabaean heroes as patriots and the Zealots as enemies of their people and of the faith of their fathers. Dr. Farmer is persuaded that Josephus deliberately disguised many of the facts, in order to free the Jews from the odium the Jewish War would bring upon them, and he assembles much evidence, some of it from Josephus himself. He shows that so far from being violators of the Law, the Zealots were passionately devoted to the Temple and the Law, and that they cherished a pathetic confidence that God would come to their help in a great act of deliverance, and that when the Temple was destroyed and it was clear that God had withdrawn from Jerusalem, they cheerfully abandoned their impregnable position and threw their lives away in an effort to leave the city.

The sect of the Dead Sea Scrolls figures in this work as standing in the succession of the devotees of the Law in the Maccabaean age, though not necessarily in the direct line that led from the Maccabees to the Zealots. Dr. Farmer does not endeavour to define the exact relation of the sect of the Scrolls to the Zealots, though he finds evidence in the War of the Sons of Light that the sect shared the military spirit and the apocalyptic hopes of the Zealots, as well as their devotion to the Law. His book was completed and in the press before the nature of the Copper Scroll was made known, or he could have found further evidence to link the sect of the Scrolls with the Zealots, at least as allies, since the inventory of treasure on the Copper Scroll referred most probably to Temple treasure.

The final chapter, on Jesus and Jewish Nationalism, well directs attention to some vital differences between our Lord and the sect of the Scrolls and the Zealots. The sect of the Scrolls is commonly connected with the Essenes, who are depicted by Josephus as pacifists. But the War Scroll offers evidence that the sect was not genuinely pacifist, and Josephus offers evidence that at the time of the Jewish War the Essenes were not pacifist, but were associated with the Zealots. Many writers have directed attention to the apocalyptic element in the teaching of Jesus and the hopes of the Early Church as evidence of the influence of the sect of the Scrolls, without noting the repudiation of nationalism and military action as differentiating Christ from the sect. While Dr. Farmer's book is not primarily concerned with the Scrolls, it is of importance for the discussion of the Scrolls because it brings into the focus of its attention these much ignored issues.

H. H. Rowley

---

## *THE BAHA'I FAITH*

In this book—*All Things Made New* : A Comprehensive Outline of the Bahá'i Faith, by Mr. John Ferraby (Allen and Unwin ; 30s. net)—the history and doctrines of a movement launched by a Persian nobleman, Baha'u'llah, in 1863 are described by a Baba'i with extensive quotations

from its writings, covering a wide range of topics —religious, ethical, social and economic. Preceded by a forerunner known as Bab, who was put to death in 1850, the Founder claimed to be a manifestation of God raised up to carry the mission of his herald to its final conclusion. This was continued by his eldest son, 'Abdu'l-Baha, who toured Western Europe and America between 1911 and 1913, and to-day it is said to be established in more than two hundred and forty-five ' states and dependencies,' and that its literature has been translated into over a hundred and seventy languages.

An initial assumption is that all religions are based on the same ultimate reality and the differences between them arise either from the different needs they were revealed to meet, or from the failure of the followers of the ' manifestation of God ' to understand properly the teaching that had been given. The elements peculiar to each, however, are contemporary and contingent, adapted to the needs of a particular age. Baha'u'llah is represented as the messenger sent by God to ' recreate creation and give fresh life to mankind ' in the present age. While he did not claim to be greater than, or intrinsically different from, the previous ' manifestations,' nevertheless he purported to exercise a kind of messianic rôle fulfilling the work and message of those who had gone before him. Since he is supposed to have fulfilled the Old Testament prophecies not fulfilled by Jesus and Muhammad, he should be accepted, it is declared, by Jews, Christians and Muslims as ' the promised one.' Inasmuch as among the aims of the movement are the promotion of world government on a spiritual basis and a reign of universal peace and security, it would be interesting to know what, if any, influence it has had or is having in its cradleland in the Middle East.

E. O. James

---

## *THE CROSS*

*The Mystery of the Cross* (S.C.M. ; 3s. 6d. net) is the title given to a fine series of five lectures delivered by the late Professor J. E. L. Oulton, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Dublin, to the students of Lincoln Theological College in Passion Week, 1956. The lectures discuss ' The Mystery of the Cross,' ' The Sin-Bearer,' ' The Cross and the Whole Creation,' ' The Appeal of the Cross,' and ' The Trinity and the Atonement.' Professor Oulton does not attempt to commend one particular theory alone, but treats the whole theme on the grandest scale. ' As Love,' he says, ' Christ's concern was with human sin. He saw what it was that divided a man against himself, that estranged man from man. . . . Then this volume of human sin seemed to be concentrated upon himself, calling to its aid the treachery of his friend, the desertion of his disciples, the malignity of his Church, the fickleness of the multitude he loved, the injustice of those in authority, and finally the barbarous cruelty of the age. The cup of suffering was indeed full, but he drank it. The measure of sin was almost intolerable. But he bore it.' This quotation is but one of the many luminous passages which these lectures contain.

Particularly interesting are Dr. Oulton's references to the Passion Music of John Sebastian Bach. ' I can never understand,' he says, ' why it is that the Christian Church as a whole does not recognize in Bach a man who in his own sphere is not unworthy to be named in the same breath as St. Paul.' The breadth and the depth of these lectures are such that one can only rejoice that by publication they will reach a much wider circle.

Vincent Taylor

---

## *THOMAS HAWEIS*

In *Thomas Haweis 1734–1820* (S.P.C.K. ; 50s. net) Dr. A. S. Wood has written an interesting biography of one of the lesser-known evangelicals of the eighteenth century. Haweis falls short, perhaps, of greatness, but he did important work as the originator of the South Sea mission ; he was a co-founder of the London Missionary Society, and a tireless agitator in the overseas cause. He found time to write a Church History, in which he said that Jonathan Edwards was a far better writer on the doctrines of grace than St. Augustine ; he also produced the ' Evangelical Expository, or a Commentary on the Holy Bible,' which was published as a complete work in 1765–66, and in evangelical circles was second in popularity only to that of Thomas Scott.

But the most interesting side of Haweis' life was his alliance with the Countess of Huntingdon. From 1774, when he became one of her chaplains, he spent the summer and autumn in his parish, and then set out as an itinerant preacher, usually visiting Brighton, London, Bath and Bristol. Haweis ' does not appear to have regarded this allegiance to the Countess of Huntingdon as constituting any breach of loyalty to the Church of England.' His defence, that as a peeress ' she had a legal right to employ her chaplains in her chapels,' seems something of a quibble. However, when the Countess left the Establishment in 1781, and ordained her own ministers in 1783, Haweis followed the example of Venn and Romaine and withdrew. In 1789, however, he returned to her support. But he did not resign his living : his Anglicanism comes out at this stage as a punctilious

refusal—reported to his Bishop—to share in the ordinations of the Connexion.

Dr. Wood has to admit the simple inconsistency of his behaviour, which became still more marked when the death of the Countess made him the virtual overseer of the body. In a concluding paragraph Dr. Wood comments that this shows that 'he was not a strict evangelical of the Samuel Walker school; though not indifferent to Church order, it was not his final standard.' But while this is true, the comment hardly saves Dr. Wood from the difficulty that he has created for himself by saying in his Introduction that Canon Charles Smyth has demonstrated that 'the fundamental divergence between Evangelicals and Methodists came over the problem of Church order.' We need a full-length historical study of the Huntingdonian Connexion, as part of a general attempt to dispel the pious haze that has in recent years descended on eighteenth-century ecclesiastical history.

JOHN KENT

---

## *MODERN NEW TESTAMENT STUDIES*

Under the rather unsatisfactory title of *The Gospel Jesus Preached* (Westminster Press, Philadelphia; $3.50) Dr. S. MacLean Gilmour gives an extremely able, clear and comprehensive survey of the conclusions and speculations of modern New Testament scholarship as they bear on the faith and teaching of the Church. It is a short book, and has to be taken as a highly compressed review of studies and researches in wide and varied fields; yet it contrives always to leave an adequate impression of how much lies behind its summary statement and how much is being either dismissed or left aside for fuller consideration.

His own position may be described in the words of judicious commendation often applied to political leaders, as being to the left of centre. In his closing words he seems to take his stand with the large number who, without any great conviction of the value of theological formulations, yet at the same time would acknowledge that there is reality in the mysteries with which dogma tries to deal. 'I think,' he says, 'I can understand why the creeds of the Church speak of the divinity of Christ.'

What is wrong with the title is its possible suggestion that a distinction may be drawn between the gospel preached by Jesus and the gospel about Jesus; and that the author regards the former as the more easy to define with historical precision that avoids theological speculation. And, indeed, in places this notion hovers in the air. But other passages supply ample corrective. For example, the rather recklessly provocative assertion on p. 129 that it is to Paul and John 'more than to Jesus Himself that Christians owe their thought of God as pre-eminently a God of love' is immediately followed by the statement that 'on the Cross Christ demonstrated the surpassing love of God for sinful men.' And while the author dwells on the difficulty of eliciting the religion of Jesus from documents whose concern is the religion about Jesus, he has also many pages on Jesus' teaching about Himself, the part of Jesus' teaching which is most noticed by Mark.

This book is more than a review and compendium of recent studies. It throws open many doors for further reflection and inquiry.

R. W. STEWART

---

## *BIBLICAL ETHICS*

There are signs that a fruitful field of study is opening up in the application to behaviour of the methods and principles of 'Biblical Theology.' Professor John Murray, of Westminster Seminary, Pa., approaches this, in his own way, with *Principles of Conduct* (Tyndale Press; 15s. net). He treats 'the process of the self-revelation of God deposited in the Bible,' in certain selected aspects, with a view to demonstrating the organic unity and continuity of the Biblical Ethic.

The treatment of the Decalogue, expressing principles as to the Divine will for man relevant from the beginning and so continuing in the order of redemption, is such as to make it clear that Dr. Murray differs both from the older liberalism and from those Biblical theologians who accept the critical reconstruction of Bible history. This is underlined by the stress on the seven mandates given to man in his state of integrity. Of these 'creation ordinances' those of Sabbath, Marriage and Labour are set out in some detail and the latter two, along with the Sanctity of Life and of Truth, given fuller treatment, each in a separate chapter.

The view of the Sabbath, which makes the Lord's Day hardly relevant, illustrates the excessive weight laid on the Old Testament. Conscious perhaps, as the reader may well be, that the grace and truth which came in Christ have been played in a minor key, Dr. Murray inserts a chapter on our Lord's Teaching which consists of an inadequate account of the Sermon on the Mount. The best parts of the book are the essays on Law and Grace, and on the Dynamic of the Biblical Ethic, which gives place to the work of the Holy Spirit, and an excursus on the Pauline New Man and Old Man.

There are many good pages in this book, but it suffers from serious defects. There is undue preoccupation with the problems of sex. The intention to illustrate a method by reference to *aspects* of the total theme leads to lack of co-ordination and this despite the rigid principle of interpretation

by which the material is governed. Dr. Murray gives substance to the fears of some that 'Biblical Theology' may be in danger of imposing on Scripture a concept of unity which it is unable to bear.

MARCUS WARD

---

*THE CONGREGATIONAL WAY*

In these days of ecumenicity it may not be without real importance as well as interest for members of a particular denomination to try to understand why the members of other communities came to be divided from them. Such a help to understanding the origins and rise of Congregationalism in England has been very fully expounded by the Rev. Geoffrey F. Nuttall, D.D., Lecturer in Church History, New College, London, in *Visible Saints : The Congregational Way 1640–1660* (Blackwell ; 25s. net). To the making of the book an enormous amount of research has been devoted, and every important statement is 'documented.' Congregationalism arose to strength in the twenty years mentioned. A slight pre-history connects itself with some names, like Pullain and Browne, but the real interest lies in the selected period. From careful examination of 'Church Books'—comparable to Presbyterian Session Records—Dr. Nuttall not only states the reasons for which an individual congregation was formed but distils the principles which all held in common. These were separation from the Established Church, Fellowship alike within the congregation and with others like-minded, Freedom from State Control, from Tradition, from Liturgies, from elaborate Creeds—Holiness, *i.e.*, being good soldiers of Jesus Christ. The last became so marked that the body was called—often in derision by their opponents, but explaining what they aimed to be—the Saints. This gives the book its title. Freedom was interpreted as full independence for every congregation to manage its own affairs without either Episcopal or Presbyterial supervision. It never meant that any congregation was so 'independent' as to ignore the benefits of fellowship with other congregations.

This book is a fine example of historical investigation, and it has the merit of being not only scholarly but of high literary quality.

W. D. NIVEN

---

The finding of the Dead Sea Scrolls has directed attention anew to the intertestamental literature covered by the cumbrous title of Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. Actually it is the Pseudepigrapha that have come alive again rather than the Apocrypha, though new attention has been given to the Books of Maccabees and to some parts of the Apocrypha. Adele Bildersee's *The Hidden Books* (Abelard-Schuman ; 15s. net) appeals to this revived interest to explain the publication of this collection of extracts from the Apocrypha, with brief introductions. The extracts here given include the whole of the Books of Tobit, Judith, Susanna, and Bel and the Dragon, the story of the Three Guardsmen from 1 Esdras, with selections from the two Books of Maccabees, Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus. The text is a modification of the Authorized Version, and the introductions are well-informed, though quite short. The passages chosen are interesting in themselves, though the reader may wonder how they are connected with the Dead Sea Scrolls, with which the Preface links them. Nor is it clear why the two Books of Maccabees are classed as legendary stories, of the same literary *genre* as Tobit and Judith.

---

The eminent authority on Hymnology, Mr. Robert Guy McCutchan, has had the notion for a book on the reasons for *Hymn Tune Names* which is published at $3·75 by the Abingdon Press. He finds it slightly aggravating that so often the same name has been given to so many different tunes and the same tune so many names ; and so often for trivial reasons or none.

However the book contains a fund of odd information, including the facts that Marie Corelli wrote a hymn, and that Sullivan's tune—'St. Gertrude'—to 'Onward Christian Soldiers' is named after the lady, not a 'saint,' in whose house he wrote it.

---

*The Inevitable Choice*, by Emeritus Professor Dr. Edmund Davison Soper (Abingdon Press ; $2.50), is an earnest book in which Dr. Soper gives an outline, clear though not profound, of Vedantic Hinduism and shows its predominance amongst the religious philosophies of India. Perhaps he tends to exaggerate this predominance, and at the present juncture in the Eastern world a fuller reference to Buddhism would have been useful. But the chief aim of this book is to give a warning against what the author regards as facile and dangerous syncretism. This purpose is unhesitatingly declared in his title, and still more so in his sub-title—'Vedanta Philosophy or Christian Gospel.' He has no use for a middle position and is full of fears for the safety of the ark of God ; and, although he is at times liberal in his appreciation of some aspects of the teaching of the Vedanta, he is in general uncompromising in his opposition to the idea that it could provide a religious view at all comparable to Christianity. To minimise the differences, he thinks, is to be a traitor to the Christian faith. Thus he rather tends to harshness of judgment, and he surely would not have us forget the possibility of a positive valuation of certain aspects of

Hinduism. It must be realised that a Vedantist will be attracted towards Christianity not by a condemnation of his ancestral faith as wholly opposed, but by induced reflection that a deeper study of its teaching will show, from its own point of view, the untenability of many of the current objections to Christianity, as, for example, the antipathy to the claim of uniqueness for Christianity and to its over-valuation of an historical basis.

---

In this book—*The Unconscious Motives of War*, by Mrs. Alix Strachey (Allen and Unwin ; 25s. net)—a psychologist, steeped in the Freudian tradition, seeks to discover a remedy for our greatest international evil—the possibility of war. Mrs. Strachey, who is assisting her husband in an authoritative edition of Freud's works, is so well equipped by her particular studies that her outlook has been rather narrowed by the exclusiveness of her devotion. In the first few chapters she gives us a valuable synopsis of Freud's theories. The evil tendencies latent beneath the human consciousness are stressed, and these are shown to be strengthened by the group mentality of the nations which is a prelude to war and becomes a morbid growth during its continuance, the final consequences being mostly deplorable. War mentality prompts to a regression to primitive and infantile attitudes which are fundamentally conducive to war.

In a penetrating analysis of mob psychology Mrs. Strachey shows the danger of this regression and hints that the peculiar relation of the individual to the State increases the peril of the situation.

Her remedy is to go further with Freud, and to use every means for the wider diffusion of psychoanalytic methods of therapy and their application to typical individuals, especially to those who are naturally aggressive, liable to the influence of mob-psychology, and likely to be placed in positions of authority. But as the number of those who according to her classification specially require training is enormous and the demand is thus likely to exceed the supply of competent psychologists, she is not very hopeful of rapid results. The influence of religion does not enter very much into her consideration, which is rather surprising seeing that the book claims to deal with human nature in its individual wholeness, set amidst the perils of collective civilization. We are left with the impression that while Freudian psychology can do much it cannot do everything in providing a remedy for the sorrows of humanity.

---

The series ' Ethical and Religious Classics of East and West ' continues its useful service. No. 19 is a translation by Mr. G. L. Lewis with Introduction and Notes of *The Balance of Truth*, by Kātib Chelebi (Allen and Unwin ; 13s. 6d. net). The author (1609–1657) was a clerk in Government service in Istanbul, but his interests were mainly scholarly. He is the author of a famous bibliographical work. *The Balance of Truth*, his last work, deals with matters both ethical and religious. Such subjects as the lawfulness of singing, tobacco, coffee, drugs and bribery are discussed, and the author shows himself to be very open-minded. Even when he disapproves of a practice he holds that it is useless to try to make people stop it. He is a good Muslim himself, but far from being fanatical, so he readily makes allowance for different points of view on matters which do not seem to affect the substance of the faith. Regarding some controversies between religious leaders he can at times make very caustic remarks. The translation is excellent, there are brief notes which supply all that is needed, and the general reader will find that the Introduction really does introduce him to the subject.

---

*Seven Days of the Week*, by Miss Rita F. Snowden (Epworth Press ; 7s. 6d. net), has as its title page quotation a saying of Dr. W. R. Maltby : ' Ordinary people, if they want religion at all, want it to live by, and not merely to think about.' So this book aims to make religion applicable to all the seven days of the week.

This book is written with all Miss Snowden's customary charm, and with all her fertility in apt and original illustration. The chapters in it are short, but the thoughts in them and the illustrations in them will be great begetters of sermons for others.

This book has also the great virtue of being a really helpful book. Miss Snowden tells of a young negro minister whose young wife died and who was wrapped in a night of despair. On the wireless he heard the voice of Dr. Harry Fosdick. He was so moved by it that he went to Dr. Fosdick's church in New York. He waited to see Dr. Fosdick and after a long talk with him he came out of the consultation room saying : ' What a man ! When I went in there all the stars had dropped out. . . . But one by one he has put them all in again ! ' Miss Snowden's own gracious and sunlit faith will surely put the stars in again for many for whom they had gone out.

---

*Popular Fallacies about the Christian Faith*, by the Rev. Donald O. Soper (Epworth Press ; 2s. 6d. net), is a paper-backed reprint of a book first published in 1938. It deals with such questions as Can we know God ?, Christ, God or Man ?, Christ's Kingdom, Here or Hereafter ?

This little book has all Dr. Soper's independence of thought, vigour of expression, and down to

earth application of the truths of the Christian gospel to ordinary every-day life.

There is one extremely interesting chapter on ' Is Christianity Practicable ? ' in which the limits of compromise are most bravely discussed and which contains a most practically helpful discussion of Christian pacifism.

---

Dr. Erik Routley, who has done so much for music in the Congregational Church, has published *The Organist's Guide to Congregational Praise* (Independent Press ; 12s. 6d. net). After a dozen pages of general advice in the Preface, the book consists of brief notes of comment and practical suggestion for each in succession of the seven hundred and seventy-eight hymns in ' Congregational Praise.' Their obvious value makes it regrettable that, the first line of the hymns not being given, even in an index, the book cannot be used without having in hand a copy of that particular hymn-book.

---

The ' Ancient Christian Writers ' series has now reached its twenty-fifth volume with the publication of St. Cyprian's two works—*The Lapsed* and *The Unity of the Catholic Church*—in this one volume, translated and annotated by Professor Maurice Bévenot, S.J. (Longmans ; 21s. net or 18s. net if a standing order is placed for the whole series).

Cyprian wrote his treatise on *The Lapsed* in A.D. 251 to lay down lengthy penance for those who had conformed and sacrificed during the Decian persecution. The treatise on *The Unity of the Catholic Church* was most probably written against the schismatic Novatian.

As usual the translation is excellent, and the notes full and scholarly. We are interested and delighted to note that a smaller and cheaper, but complete and unabridged, edition of certain of the earlier volumes of this series is soon to make its appearance.

---

*A Handbook of the Gospels*, by the Rev. G. P. Gilmour (McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario), is a book written for a special purpose. It is a book written to form the background of a series of lectures to University freshmen in McMaster University. It is the conviction of the writer that the Bible has a right and proper place in the curriculum of College students. And it is also his conviction that the Bible suffers as much from ill-usage—even at the hands of its so-called friends—as it does from neglect. This book is written to bring the results of modern scholarship to bear on the Bible so that the Bible may become intelligible, and so that it may be seen to be ' not gruel for infants and invalids, but meat for men.'

The book is in three sections : An Introduction to the Bible ; Introducing the Gospels ; Jesus in the Gospels. This book has obviously been produced and printed for its own particular University ; but it very definitely deserves a much wider public, and we would be very glad to see it re-issued for general use.

---

*A Paraphrase of Ephesians*, by the Very Rev. S. C. Carpenter, D.D. (Mowbray ; 3s. net), is a really helpful book.

It has a brief Introduction in which the authorship of Ephesians is wisely discussed. The paraphrase itself is more than a paraphrase, and much more than a new translation. It is a kind of translation and commentary interwoven. Dr. Carpenter is never afraid to expand, when expansion will clarify the meaning. Ephesians is not an easy Epistle, and this is an ideal way to make it meaningful for those who have neither the time nor the training to examine the commentaries for themselves.

Dr. Carpenter modestly writes : ' Even if my version be found small change for the gold of the original, it is, I hope, legal tender, and anyhow it is current coin.' This book more than justifies its author's claim.

---

*The Triumph of Grace in the Theology of Karl Barth*, by Professor G. C. Berkouwer (Paternoster Press ; 18s. net), brings together, in a competent way, what Barth has written on the central theme of his theology—the doctrine of grace. As the author has been writing on Barth for over twenty years it is not surprising that he shows a considerable acquaintance with the discussions on this subject which have appeared in books and journals during that period. This applies particularly to Continental studies, though there are also valuable comments on and criticisms of British and American writers. Professor Berkouwer, on the whole, is very much in agreement with Barth, though he dares to differ from him on such matters as the interpretation of kenosis and the meaning of death, where he claims that Barth has departed from the teaching of Holy Writ. He tries valiantly to make intelligible the relation between Barth's interpretation of ' the final restoration of all things ' and the passing into nothingness which is associated with his understanding of sin, but there is still need for more light on this subject, as indeed there is on the doctrine of ' the ontological impossibility of sin.'

The chief merit of the book is that it conscientiously reproduces Barth's teaching on Grace in Creation, Election, Reconciliation and Eschatology. It also contains a valuable comparison of Barth's interpretation of Grace with that taught at Rome and elsewhere.

# Devotional and Pastoral Classics

## Richard Baxter's 'The Reformed Pastor'

By Principal J. T. Wilkinson, M.A., B.D., Hartley Victoria College, Manchester

Just over three hundred years ago Richard Baxter gave to the world a small volume of some five hundred pages, which was eventually to become a classic concerning the Christian ministry. It was entitled *Gildas Salvianus : The Reformed Pastor.* The 'Preface' was dated 15th April, 1656. A second and enlarged edition appeared in the following year. Five reprints of the whole work were issued between 1707 and 1860, and in addition three abridged editions, the last of which had reached its fifth reprint by 1862. There are two modern editions of the work, both in abridged form.[1]

I

The title of the work is interesting and informative. Gildas was a sixth-century historian who had written plainly concerning the sins of Britain ; a century earlier in Gaul Salvian had been similarly outspoken regarding the miseries of his time. So Baxter 'I entitled the treatise *Gildas Salvianus* because I imitated Gildas and Salvianus in my liberty of speech to the Pastors of the Church.' From this it is clear that Baxter used the word 'reformed' in the sense of reformation of life and duty, and not with reference to the Reformed as distinguished from the Romish ministry.

The time demanded such a challenge, for the problem of unsatisfactory ministers was a serious one, and none more than Baxter realized the tremendous importance of the pastoral office. Indeed, he had a right to speak. His experience at Kidderminster gave him moral warrant to call the ministry of England to consider its own reformation. He could write later of his work there : 'When I came thither first there was about one family in a street that worshipped God and called on His name, and when I came away there were some streets where there was not past one family in the side of the street that did not so, and that did not, by professing serious godliness, give us hopes of their sincerity.'[2] He had behind him the unquestionable authority that belongs to a successful ministry.

The roots of the work are to be found in Baxter's diligent catechizing throughout his parish, and his dream of a wider application of this work. He was concerned about the lack of discipline generally throughout the parishes, and he felt that if the ministers could 'come together in one way' there would be a more effective administration. On Thursday afternoons he had been accustomed to meet the ministers at his house, and at one such meeting—in the spring of 1652—Baxter explained his ideals. His conviction was clear : 'All churches either rise or fall as the ministry doth rise or fall . . . in knowledge, zeal and ability for their work.'

It was decided that a larger meeting should be held at Worcester so that he might tell of 'the design which was consented to by the ministers.' Baxter was asked to frame an agreement—a decision which was the beginning of the famous 'Worcestershire Association.' In its earliest stages more than fifty ministers signed with Baxter at the head. Through weakness Baxter was unable to preach to the assembled ministers at Worcester on 4th December, 1655 : he enlarged and published the sermon. He entitled the work *The Reformed Pastor.* The treatise was finished on Christmas Day, 1655.

II

In the three centuries since its publication *The Reformed Pastor* has exerted some influence upon every generation of the Christian ministry.[3]

Its contemporary influence is reflected in the extant correspondence of Baxter. Here is the confession of the young rector of a London parish : 'Your *Reformed Pastor* hath . . . engaged me to a dealing with my whole parish family by family, a worke tho' of the greatest difficulty, yet of the greatest comfort.' A minister in Suffolk writes : 'You have set before me a two-fold looking-glass : the one in your *Rest*[4] to dresse myself by, as a Christian : the other in your *Gildas Salvianus* to dresse myself by, as honours with the high and weighty calling of a minister.' Yet another—writing from Trinity College, Cambridge : 'The Lord hath awakened me by some passages in yr Guildas Salv. in ye exhort. to get truth . . . stirred well up to a more thorough examinacion.' A further correspondent writes : 'I wish with all my heart

[1] Ed. J. T. Wilkinson [1939] ; 2nd ed. 1950, reprinted 1956 ; ed. Hugh Martin [1957].

[2] R. Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxterianae*, i. 84–85.

[3] For a full survey see my edition, pp. 15–47.

[4] *I.e., The Saint's Everlasting Rest* [1650].

all young ministers on their entrance to the ministry would diligently and frequently peruse it.'

This contemporary influence was not confined to England. A Swiss pastor tells Baxter that he has bought the book in London, and goes on to speak of the gratitude of his brethren and himself for such discovery. The book almost certainly had some influence upon the *collegia pietatis* of Phillip Jacob Spener, the founder of German pietism, and it is not without significance that shortly after Spener's death it was translated into German. The annals of the New England churches also bear witness to the influence of Baxter's book. Indeed Baxter himself was not unaware of the widespread influence of this work: 'I have very great cause to be thankful to God . . . that it prevailed with many ministers to set up that work which I there exhort them to.' [1]

The next century has also its testimony. Both John Fletcher of Madeley and Philip Doddridge of Northampton appear to have framed schemes for ministerial associations after the pattern of Baxter's own experiment. The latter writes of Baxter's book: 'The Reformed Pastor is a most extraordinary performance, and should be read by every young minister before he takes a people under his stated care: and I think the practical part should be reviewed every three or four years: for nothing would have a greater tendency to awaken the spirit of a minister to that zeal in his work, for want of which many good men are but shadows of what, by the blessing of God, they might be, if the maxims and measures laid down in that incomparable treatise were strenuously pursued.' In the training of ministers in the Northampton Academy Baxter's work must have counted for much.

The Rev. Samuel Wesley was under its spell. In a tract entitled *Advice to a Young Clergyman* he writes: 'I wish I had the *Gildas Salvianus* again which I lost when my house was burnt.' John Wesley valued it highly in terms of pastoral guidance for his preachers: 'Every travelling preacher must instruct from house to house. . . . Can we find a better method of doing this than Mr. Baxter? . . . His *Gildas Salvianus* is well worth a capable perusal.' Thomas Rutherford, a friend of Wesley and a Methodist preacher for thirty-four years, made an abridgement of the work in 1806. He writes: 'I intend it more especially for the younger preachers. . . . Every minister, and in particular every Methodist preacher, ought to make it a kind of pocket-companion, to read it frequently and examine himself by it.' Francis Asbury made it his companion as he travelled across the Alleghennies —'a most excellent book for a gospel preacher.' Having at one time lost his copy, he notes the thrill of discovery many years later: 'O what a prize: Baxter's *Reformed Pastor* fell into my hands this morning.'

During the nineteenth century the influence of the book continued. Evidence of this is found in the fact that the abridged edition of Dr. William Brown of Edinburgh, first published in 1829, reached a fifth edition within thirty years. For Dr. Thomas Chalmers it was a formative influence. John Angell James of Carr's Lane, Birmingham, was caught by its spell: 'I have been sustained by Baxter in his *Reformed Pastor*.' On Saturday evenings when his pulpit preparation was finished this book was his frequent reading. Similarly, Charles Haddon Spurgeon was accustomed to read the book on Sunday evenings in order that he might 'renew the art of pleading on behalf of the Gospel.' A Scottish layman, Mr. Henderson, gave every minister of the United Presbyterian Church a copy of James' *An Earnest Ministry: A Tract for the Times*, and with it Baxter's *Reformed Pastor*, the latter being reprinted at the recommendation of James himself. Dr. Marcus Dods began his ministry under the stimulus of this work, and in his twenty-ninth year set down in his diary a passage from the work as a summary of his spiritual aims.

Similarly the twentieth century has its testimony. In recollection of its formative influence Dr. Hensley Henson, Bishop of Durham, writes: 'It is literally true that Baxter's *Reformed Pastor* gave colour and direction to my efforts.' In his manual, *Heralds of God*, Dr. James S. Stewart urges the reading of spiritual classics and names this book—'after three hundred years still so sure a guide.' In his book, *The Art of Preaching*, Dr. David Smith declares: 'To this day I recall my first reading of it as no less than an epoch in my ministry: and I would place before you one of its burning sentences: "Look upon your congregation believingly and with compassion." This appeal gripped me, and haunted me when first I read it at the outset of my ministry. I had it placarded on the wall of my vestry that it might greet my eye every time I approached my pulpit.'

It would seem then that, beyond its setting in the seventeenth century, this book preserves timeless values by which any minister of Christ may test his soul and rally his powers to the fulfilment of his vocation. Multitudes of men have drunk at this spring as they have sought to fulfil their ministry in obscure places. Dr. Bates, who preached Baxter's funeral sermon in 1691, spoke of *The Reformed Pastor* as 'the accomplished model of an evangelical minister' and added: 'The ideal of a faithful minister delineated in that book was a copy taken from life, from his own zealous example.' In *Grace Abounding* we have mirrored

[1] *Reliquiae Baxterianae*, i. 115.

the experience of John Bunyan as the Christian pilgrim: in *The Reformed Pastor* we see Richard Baxter as the faithful shepherd of the flock of Christ.

III

A survey of *The Reformed Pastor* shows a fine perspective in Baxter's mind regarding the Christian ministry. It is everywhere viewed comprehensively. Let us listen to his own words.

Baxter summarizes the *content* of the ministry with great precision:

'The subject matter of the ministerial work is in general spiritual things, or matters that concern the pleasing of God and the salvation of our people. It is not about temporal and transitory things. . . . It is the first great work of the ministers of Christ to acquaint men with that God that made them, and is their happiness; to open to them the treasures of His goodness, and tell them of the glory that is in His Presence . . . and set them on seeking durable treasure. . . . In a word, we must teach them of the word and works of God. O what two volumes are these for a minister to preach upon! How great, how excellent, how wonderful, how mysterious! All Christians are disciples or scholars of Christ; the Church is His school; we are His ushers; the Bible is His grammar. . . . Our business is to help them to understand this book of God.'

Holding the *objective* of the ministry to be 'the increase of the number and strength of the saints', Baxter never loses sight of the individual stress and we can see reflected in his own words the work of his parish of Kidderminster with its four thousand souls.

'It is now too common for men to think that the work of the ministry is nothing but to preach well, to baptize and administer the Lord's Supper and visit the sick. . . . They have hundreds of people to whom they never spoke a word personally for their salvation; and if we may judge by their practice they take it not for their duty. . . . A schoolmaster must not only read a common lecture, but take a personal account of his scholars or else he is likely to do little good. If physicians should only read a public lecture of physic, their patients would not be much the better for them; nor would a lawyer secure your estate by reading a lecture of law. The charge of a pastor requireth personal dealing as well as any of these.'

As Baxter looked out upon the England of his day he felt deeply that *a sense of urgency* lay upon the ministry. The prime responsibility was *the conversion of souls*. So he pleads:

'Dost thou live close by them, or meet them in the streets, or labour with them, or travel with them, or sit still and talk with them and say nothing to them of their souls and the life to come? If their house were on fire thou wouldest run and help them. . . If thou knewest but a remedy for their diseases thou wouldest tell it them. . . . What then shall we say of them that know the remedy for curing souls and do not reveal it nor persuade men to make use of it?'

In Baxter's thought about such responsibility this sense of urgency was also expressed in regard to *the unity of the church*.

'I intreat of you that you be very tender of the unity and peace of the catholic church. . . . Unite in necessary truths and tolerate tolerable failings and bear with one another. . . . I beseech all the ministers of Christ to compassionate the poor divided Church, and to entertain such catholic principles and charitable dispositions, as tend to their own and the common peace. Hath anything done more to lose our authority and disable us for God's service than our differences and divisions? If ministers could but be all of a mind, or at least concur in the sustance of the work, we might then do wonders for the Church of Christ. . . . O how happy had England been, how happy had all the Church been . . . if the ministers of the Gospel had taken these courses.'

In an eloquent passage Baxter also indicates the *privileges* of the ministry:

'Is it nothing to be bred up to learning when others are bred in the plough and cart: and to be furnished with so much delightful knowledge when the world lieth in ignorance? Is it nothing to converse with learned men and talk of high and glorious things when others must converse with almost none but silly ignorants? But especially, what an excellent life is it to live in studying and preaching Christ! To be still searching into the mysteries or feeding on them: to be daily in the consideration of the blessed nature or works or ways of God. . . . Our employment is all high and spiritual. To live among so many silent wise companions whenever we please and of such variety!'

Baxter is also quite clear in his convictions about the *requirements* of the ministry. There must be *intellectual* equipment. Of this Baxter had no doubt: there must be a strong foundation for mental certainties; there must be a scheme of thought concerning the glory of the Divine revelation. Hence the importance of a thorough understanding of the Scriptures, though Baxter was no scripturalist in the narrow sense.

'Our evidences and our ornaments must be spiritual from the Holy Scripture. . . . The wisdom of this world must not be magnified against the wisdom of God: philosophy [1] must be taught to stoop and serve, while faith doth bear the chief sway. . . . Let all writers have their due esteem,[2] but compare none of

[1] The word is used in the contemporary sense of the field of knowledge as a whole.

[2] Few contemporaries had a wider extent of reading than had Baxter.

them with the word of God. We will not refuse their services, but we must abhor them as competitors. There is a con-naturality in a spiritual heart towards the word of God.'

It is when Baxter reminds the minister of Christ about *the necessity of personal dedication* that he becomes most penetrating.

'All our work must be managed reverently, as beseemeth them that believe the presence of God and use not holy things as common. The more of God appeareth in our duties the more authority will they have with men, and reverence signifieth a mind that is much conversant with God. . . . All our work must be done spiritually, as by men possessed of the Holy Ghost.'

Again with even greater penetration:

'O brethren, watch over your own hearts. . . . Be much with God . . . a Minister should take some special pains with his heart before he is to go to the congregation. Go then specially to God for life. . . .'

He asserts that this self-dedication must be entire.

'Take heed to yourselves lest you unsay with your lives what you say with your tongues. This is the way to make men think that the word of God is an idle tale. . . One proud, surly, lordly word, one needless contention, one covetous action may cut the throat of many a sermon and blast the fruit of all that you have been doing. . . . Do you regard the success of your labours and will not put up with an injury, or a foul word, nor stoop to the meanest, nor forbear your passionate and lordly carriage, no! not for the winning of souls and the attaining of the end of all your labours?'

It is little wonder that it was said of Baxter that he was possessed 'of weighty soul concerns, his spirit drenched therein.'

And this vocation of the ministry must be pursued to the end!

'What have we our time and strength for but to lay both out for God? What is a candle made for but to burn? Burnt and wasted we must be, and is it not fit it should be in the lighting men to heaven? He that works much lives much. Our life is to be esteemed according to the end of it, and not according to the mere duration . . . the smallest parish hath so much work that may employ all our diligence night and day.'

IV

These extracts form but glimpses into the depths of this penetrating volume. The words of Dr. Henson, Bishop of Durham, spoken at the unveiling of a tablet to Baxter's memory in Christ Church, Newgate Street, London, in 1925, may serve as a final estimate of this book: '*The Reformed Pastor* is the best manual of the clergyman's duty in the language because it leaves on the reader's mind an ineffacable impression of the sublimity and awfulness of spiritual ministry.'

# Recent Foreign Theology

**Qumran Theology.** Among the many books which are appearing on the Dead Sea Scrolls, a German study by Professor Nötscher on the Theological Terminology of the sect is deserving of attention.[1] Here the author studies the conception of knowledge in Mandaism, Manichaeism, amongst Jewish and Christian Gnostics, in the already known intertestamental literature, in the New Testament and in the Qumran texts. This is followed by a study of dualism, of light and darkness, and of eschatological thought. Throughout the work betrays the learning and the caution of the author, and every reader will learn from every page—not only about the Scrolls but about the other literature which is here brought into relation with them. Many of the special theological terms found in the Scrolls are given careful examination in the appropriate section of the book, which offers a more solid contribution to the discussion of the texts than some of the more colourful discussions of the history of the sect. Professor Nötscher is reluctant to find foreign influence on the sect, and is doubtful how far its members thought they were living on the eve of the last days. A certain amount of Iranian influence had been assimilated by Judaism in the Persian age and some has long been recognized in the Book of Daniel. Despite the bitter fight against Greek influence in the Maccabaean age, this Iranian influence was not similarly rejected. Hence, despite the intense exclusiveness of the Qumran sect, it need occasion no surprise if they show traces of this Iranian influence which had penetrated various Jewish groups to a varying extent.

[1] *Zur theologischen Terminologie der Qumrantexte* [1956]. (*Bonner Biblischer Beiträge*, No. 10). Hanstein; DM 22·50.

---

**Moses.** In the series of little books on 'Maîtres Spirituels,' André Neher has written on *Moses*.[2] This is not a critical study of the life and work of Moses, but a moving study of the significance of the figure of Moses for the Jews of all ages, and especially to-day. The shadow of Hitler lies upon the author, and he sees in the Egyptian bondage the symbol of the persecution to which Jews have been constantly subjected down to our own times.

[2] *Moïse et la vocation juive* [1956]. Édition du Seuil, Paris; Fr. 350.

Yet he writes without bitterness, but only with fine penetration of the rich spiritual fruits which pain and sorrow may yield when they lead to the mountain of God. Readers will find here a choice Jewish spirit, of deep and tender piety, and a loyalty to the will of the God of Moses that will stir their hearts. The book is profusely illustrated from the work of ancient and modern artists, though the production of the pictures is not very good.

---

**Psalm 36.** A Dutch doctoral dissertation by L. A. F. le Mat, written in English, is devoted to the examination of Ps 36.[1] The author undertakes a detailed study of the text of the Psalm, in which he adheres closely to the consonantal text of the Massoretes, while feeling free to vary the vowels. He then studies the heading of the Psalm and concludes that it suggests that the Psalm is pre-exilic and was composed for, and perhaps by, a King, and that it was first preserved in the palace archives for the use of the royal household. He next turns to the evildoers of the Psalm, and, while allowing that Mowinckel may be in part right in his equation of them with sorcerers, is strongly critical of the Norwegian scholar. An instructive chapter on the history of the exegesis of the Psalter follows, from which it appears that certain twentieth-century approaches were not without their nineteenth-century forerunners. While there is nothing strikingly original in this work, the reader will learn a great deal about the Psalter in general, and about the scholarly work done on it during the last century.

---

**The Dead Sea Scrolls.** The stream of books on the Dead Sea Scrolls shows no sign of running dry. Father J. T. Milik, who is one of the international team of scholars working on the Scrolls, has published a little book, entitled *Ten Years of Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*,[2] with a Preface by Father de Vaux. There is a good account of the content of the finds, and some new information is given, though without details, in a chronological table. Father Milik identifies the Wicked Priest with Jonathan, the brother of Judas Maccabaeus. The Teacher of Righteousness he is not able to identify, but he supposes that he was the author of the Hymns and that these are autobiographical. There is no evidence for this supposition, and the Teacher is unmentioned in the Hymns. Father Milik, like many other authors, equates the sect of the Scrolls with the Essenes. He has a useful chapter on the importance of the discoveries, and his book includes many excellent illustrations.

A second book, by H. E. del Medico, is of a very different character. This is entitled *The Enigma of the Dead Sea Manuscripts*,[3] and it maintains that so far from the sect being the Essenes, there were no Essenes at all, and they are a mere figment of the imagination, the name being the invention of Philo, and the account in Josephus being a late interpolation. The Teacher of Righteousness is identified with Menahem, who lived in the first century of our era, and the composition of the texts preserved in the Scrolls is thought to have gone on long after the date assigned by the archaeologists to the deposit in the Qumran caves. Dr. del Medico believes the caves constituted a *genizah*, where unwanted MSS. were placed, and thinks they continued to be placed there for a very long time. The view that the Teacher was Menahem has been put forward in this country more recently than by Dr. del Medico, and has been advanced by no less eminent a scholar than Dr. G. R. Driver, who does not, however, share all the views of del Medico.

A third book is by Father Daniélou, and it discusses *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins*.[4] The author rejects some of the more extreme views that link the Scrolls and the New Testament, and in particular finds no evidence that the Teacher of Righteousness was martyred or closely resembled Christ, either in his experience or in the thought of his followers. Father Daniélou allows more influence of the sect on John the Baptist than the reviewer would, though he underlines some of the points of sharp difference between the sect and our Lord. An interesting surmise is that the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs were the work of an Essene who had been converted to Christianity.

It will be seen that these three books are of very varied character, and that they represent different points of view and approach. The debate on the Scrolls is likely to continue for a long time. It is becoming more circumscribed than it was at first, though del Medico's book breaks through the bounds and reopens the question of the date of the Scrolls. It is unlikely that this will find any wide following, though it is well that we should constantly be rechallenged to examine our positions. The most hotly debated question at the moment is the relation between the sect of the Scrolls and the Early Church, and on this Daniélou's book will be found of value. Indeed, all of these books in their differing ways make some contribution to the study of the Scrolls, though clearly not all the positions adopted in them can be right.

H. H. Rowley

*Manchester University*

---

[1] *Textual Criticism and Exegesis of Psalm xxxvi.* [1957]. Kemink en Zoon, Utrecht.

[2] *Dix ans de découvertes dans le Désert de Juda* [1957]. Éditions du Cerf, Paris.

[3] *L'Enigme des manuscrits de la Mer Morte* [1957]. Plon, Paris ; Fr. 1350.

[4] *Les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte et les Origines du Christianisme* [1957]. Editions de l'Orante, Paris.

# In the Study

## Virginibus Puerisque

### Making Light of It

By H. F. Mathews, M.A., Ph.D., Alsager, Cheshire

'. . . the things which happened unto me have fallen out rather unto the progress of the gospel; so that my bonds became manifest in Christ throughout the whole praetorian guard, and to all the rest.'—Ph $1^{12-13}$ (R.V.).

Even if you have heard of Yspytty Ifan you would be hard pressed to spell it, unless you can speak Welsh. It is the name of a rather drab, forgotten village near the source of the River Conway. Many years ago the Knights Hospitaller of St. John kept a 'hospice' there: Yspytty Ifan really means 'Hospitium of John.' In its wonderful old church all the princes of Gwydir are buried, and the place is packed full of history.

Once it was a busy place, with fairs and markets and great men living there. But in recent years people have drifted away from the village where it is so hard to make a living. The slate quarries have closed down. Houses have become derelict. There are only eight children left in the village school. A handful of people go to the ancient church, and the 'capel mawr' (big chapel) has only a fraction of the great congregation of yesteryear. Only one little shop is left, and it sells everything. Anyone who wants to get on has to leave and go to the town. The village is slowly dying.

But come across the Sanctuary Bridge which spans the river and meet Thomas John Roberts, the miller. He will show you the huge French and Belgian stones which his grandfather bought to grind the corn for miles around. They cost him £12 a pair: now they would cost £300. 'So,' he says, as he looks longingly at the last pair of stones still working, 'when they finish, I finish.' He just cannot buy new stones to grind a bit of poultry meal and pig food, for all the table flour is now milled in huge modern mills miles away. But there is a glint in Thomas John's eye, and if you follow him to the ground floor you will see why.

He decided that he would do what he could to stem the tide of decay in the village. So he tapped the river with a pipe which he buried underground to bring the greatest possible head of water into his mill. He bought and installed a turbine generator—a simple affair which needed little maintenance. His friends in the village wondered what 'Thomas John, the Mill' was doing now. He said nothing until he was sure it would work.

It did, and now he supplies electricity to the whole village. He charges half a crown a lamp per quarter, and it doesn't matter how much electricity anyone uses, for the river supplies it all. If Mrs. Jones wants a little more power for an extra big baking day, all she has to do is to step across to the mill where Mr. Roberts twiddles the control knobs and steps up the output. It looked once as though Thomas John Roberts would become one of the forgotten men as his millstones wore out and became useless. But he made himself the general manager of the power station! The fate which ruined other men was for him a challenge to serve. In both senses, he made light of it!

We honour those who make light of difficulties in the sense in which we usually employ the phrase. Many a mountaineer, on returning from a hazardous climb in which he nearly lost his life, has said, 'Yes, it was fairly steep.' I have known people who suffered great pain with high gallantry, and when I have asked how they were, they have put on a brave smile and said, 'Fairly comfortable, thank you.' Such courage is grand.

But there is just as much to admire in men like the miller of Yspytty Ifan, who have seen difficulties as a call to serve their fellows in some new way. One of the finest stories of that kind has yet to be told. For we can only guess all that lies behind the words of our text. Paul's mission was suddenly halted. He was flung into gaol. A lesser man would have moped and lamented his misfortune. But Paul used even that bitter experience to bring the light of the gospel of Jesus to the pagan soldiers who guarded him—and who knows what results that evangelization had in the Roman Empire?

It is good to make light of your troubles. But it is better to bring light from them to other folk.

---

### A Great Surprise

By Rita F. Snowden, Vice-President of the Methodist Church, New Zealand

I walked in the fine city of Christchurch one morning this week. The sun shone pleasantly on the shops and houses and gardens, and on the trees lining the banks of the river. Everything seemed as usual—cars and vans hurrying along, going about their business—till presently I came to a street where some of them were parked.

Then suddenly I saw a sight so strange that I couldn't believe my eyes. Parked there on the kerbside was a van—a grey van, with words printed in large red letters across its back: 'CAUTION—BLIND MAN DRIVING!'

I read those large red letters; then I read them again: 'CAUTION — BLIND MAN DRIVING!' 'Well,' I said to myself, 'this is odd: I didn't know that a blind man was allowed to drive. I'm sure he wouldn't be in my city. Surely there must be accidents—I wonder the blind man likes to do it, even if permission is given.'

Next my eyes moved from the bold lettering on the back of the van to some, not quite so large, on the side—though still in red, except for one word. And suddenly I saw that it was a tradesman's van, advertising in this arresting way the fact that he had a certain make of venetian blinds for sale! And as I stood there I began to chuckle. He had caught me out, and got my attention in exactly the way he had hoped he might. It was a great surprise.

There are, I suddenly realized as I stood there, several sorts of blind men. There is first of all the man who sells blinds—the man who drives that van about the city streets, and so cleverly draws attention to his wares. Then there is the blind man who has no eyes, and must find his way around as best he can with a white stick, in a continual night. And then, more surprising, there is the man who has eyes, but cannot or will not see. Helen Keller, who has been deaf and dumb and blind since she was a little girl—and she is now an old lady, loved and honoured all round the world—says that this is the worst kind of blindness of all. And she ought to know, because she has been all over the world, to every country, trying to help blind people. Nobody has tried so hard and for so long—and this is what she says: 'I know many people who have perfect eyes, but are really blind.' Now that's strange, isn't it? And Helen Keller tells us how it is. She says: 'Their eyes are open, but their hearts are closed.'

Do you know anyone like that? It's a very sad kind of blindness, Helen Keller thinks, and more deserving of pity than her own kind of blindness. Because, whatever people's eyes are like, when their hearts are closed it's very hard for beautiful things to get through to them.

That's exactly what Jesus found when He walked day after day in Palestine with that little group of men who were His disciples and tried to give them beautiful and true ideas. For a time they argued among themselves with their hearts closed—and Jesus saw how things were, and He put to them this question that is now in our New Testament: 'You have eyes, do you not see?' (Mk $8^{18}$ [Moffatt]).

It seems strange that anyone in this beautiful world, having good eyes, should not see. But it all depends on whether their hearts—our hearts—are open as well as our eyes.

So the little prayer that somebody wrote a long time ago needs often to be on your lips and mine:

Thou who hast given me eyes to see
And love this sight so fair,
Give me a heart to find out Thee,
And read Thee everywhere.

---

## The Christian Year

NINETEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

### The Paradoxes of our Ministry[1]

### I. 'As deceivers, and yet true'

BY THE REVEREND DOUGLAS STEWART, M.A., LONDON

Chapter six of Second Corinthians contains St. Paul's apologia for the Christian ministry, and gives us a picture of an apostolic succession which has been directly experienced by the ministers and priests of all Christian denominations in every age, and down to our own times. We are still 'the ministers of God in much patience, in afflictions, in necessities, in distresses.' How many pastors in modern Europe have known 'stripes, imprisonments, tumults'! We still labour 'by pureness, by knowledge, by long-suffering, by kindness, by the Holy Ghost, by love unfeigned.' But in this series of sermons we shall be concerned with the paradoxes of our ministry, set out in *vv.* 8 to 10, which are also timeless and inescapable. We begin with the fact that we are 'as deceivers, and yet true.'

(1) It is of the utmost importance to understand the inevitability of this. The Christian preacher must appear to the men of every age as a 'deceiver.' And this should be especially underlined to-day when we are being told on all sides that our problem is simply one of *communication*. The argument is that our language and liturgy are out-dated, and that we have not learned how to use the modern machines of communication—radio, cinema, T.V., and the rest.

Now, of course, the Church ought to speak to men in a language they can understand, and we ought to learn how to use modern means of mass-communication. But behind the argument lurks

[1] A sermon in this series—the Paradoxes in 2 Co $6^{8-10}$—will appear each month.—ED.

the presupposition that ' if only ' we did this then men would, inevitably, listen to us. I believe that presupposition to be false. We ought to use modern means of communication, not because the gospel is easy of belief when understood, but because it is so hard for men to believe that we must remove every temporal and accidental barrier. The real barrier remains. We seem to be ' deceivers.'

The paradox emerges at its simplest because we speak of the spiritual world. The physical world is there. All men immediately know it. When Dr. Johnson kicked a stone to confute Bishop Berkley's philosophy he expressed the solid sense of humanity that the world we see and touch is the real world. Sun, moon and stars : the earth with its myriad forms of life : the geological ages written into the rocks : the history of man upon his planet : all these are indisputably *real*. Physicist, astronomer, geologist, historian are trustworthy because they tell us of the *known*. By contrast the preacher speaks of what cannot so be known. He sounds a ' deceiver.'

Every word we use—God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, heaven, hell—is open to the same objection. No one has seen God. The Jesus of history can be understood but we speak of Him as the Christ of faith. Faith, a word so fundamental to us, appears to our hearers as the double-headed penny, the card-sharper's pack. Men want to know God objectively as they know the world. The call to faith appears a part of our deceiver's art. We invent, we imagine, we pretend, and try to sell the result as truth.

The Christian preacher may seem to be on firmer ground when he speaks, not of a hypothetical spiritual world, but of the spirit of man himself. Man knows himself an animal, but few men can reconcile themselves to a life of sheer animality. There is something here which responds to the gospel. But here also there is a resistance, and it is two-fold. First there is the question of the soul. Like God, like the Christ, like faith, the soul of man is, scientifically speaking, unknown.

' For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts ; even one thing befalleth them : as the one dieth, so dieth the other ; yea, they have all one breath ; so that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast : . . . All go unto one place ; all are of the dust, and all return to dust again. Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth ? ' That dark word of wisdom from the ancient world still echoes in modern thought. Whoever speaks of the eternal life of the soul is a ' deceiver.'

Secondly, and more seriously, the preacher is urging his hearers in some sense to give up ' the here and now,' the world we assuredly know, and the life we indubitably experience, in order to enjoy the hypothetical blessings of life in the spirit, life ' in Christ,' life with God. The gospel at this point becomes a threat. It plays upon conscience, altruism, idealism : it plays upon fear of death, fear of retribution, and the despair inherent in the human situation. It would cheat us of the only birth-right we know—life on earth —in the name of the unknown, unproven life of heaven.

We speak of the unknown as though it could be known : we urge men to buy, with life itself as the price, an illusory world of spiritual experience. We are ' deceivers.'

(2) And yet we speak the truth. We are ' as deceivers, and yet true.' For this paradox of our ministry rests upon the paradox enunciated by Christ, ' He that findeth his life shall lose it : and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it.' Ultimately we neither cheat nor deceive. It is the worldly mind which is subject to illusion.

Our situation has been defined with the utmost clarity in a recent Third Programme talk by E. F. Schumacher.[1] Schumacher distinguishes three states of the human mind. The first he calls innocence, and in the state of innocence we accept the conventions and dogmas of faith without question. ' Every child, it would seem, passes through this stage ; many people remain there all their lives.' But although an integrated, this is not a stable condition. It is threatened by ' the first great awakening ' which Mr. Schumacher says ' is the discovery of the use and power of logical reasoning.' This creates a state of rationalism in which the dogmas of faith crumble under the surge of the questioning mind. ' Innocence is lost ; piety is lost.'

As innocence is an integrated state it tries to defend itself against the disintegration of reason, but ' there is no possibility of fruitful argument between people at different stages. The man at the level of primitive religiosity can see only the lack of innocence, the lack of piety, the lack of simple happiness in the man who has reached the level of rationalism.'

The rationalist assumes, having passed beyond innocence to reason, that his is the final state of man. It is difficult for him to imagine a world ' beyond reason ' just as reason is beyond innocence. He tries to see the ' beyond reason ' world of faith as a return to ignorance. Schumacher is discussing the attack by Mr. Charles Frankel on Jacques Maritain, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Arnold Toynbee. But, of course, an attack on these three thinkers which tries to equate their thinking with primitive ignorance or innocence is absurd. There is a

[1] Published in *The Listener*, 23rd May, 1957.

'third state' of man, the state of faith, which is as far beyond rationalism as rationalism is beyond innocence. It follows a second great awakening when we see that the reason of man cannot be the final arbiter of reality. As the rationalist looks down upon the valley in which primitive innocence flourishes so the man of faith climbs up and beyond the world of human reason and looks down upon it.

It is exactly in this sense that we are 'as deceivers and yet true.' Our great problem of 'communication' comes in here. How shall we speak to a world in which it is taken as axiomatic that 'man is the measure of all things' and that human reason is the judge of ultimate truth?

It is at this point that St. Paul's next paradox comes in 'as unknown, and yet well-known,' but before going on to analyse that phrase (as we shall in the next sermon) there are two comments we can make on the position now outlined.

Innocence is a state of relative integration. That is why many people of proven intelligence in other fields cling to religious innocence against the assaults of reason. Rationalism is, by its very nature, disintegrating. There is an inevitability about the H-bomb which lies at the heart of the scientific intelligence of man. But man cannot rest in disintegration. As the inner urge of life drives him out of innocence into rationalism the same dynamic process urges him beyond reason to a higher integration of mind and will.

Although 'as deceivers' we are yet 'true.' The ultimate, integrating word is the word which we preach. Our failure, therefore, is always present but never ultimate. 'The Word' cannot be 'void.'

The second relevant comment is best put in the form of a question. Who is competent to speak of the world beyond the seen and known? In no realm of knowledge do we trust the self-proclaimed ignoramus. 'I'm not interested in music.' 'I know nothing about art.' 'I'm not a scientist.' As soon as the phrase comes out we brace ourselves against the assault of ignorance. The man without interest in music, the man who knows nothing about art, the man undisciplined by science, can only offer worthless opinions. Only those who love can enlighten. Are we so irrational when we insist that that principle is sound also for the world of the spirit? Only those who love can enlighten. The opinions of the worldly mind are without weight against the preaching of those who 'know the love that God has for us' and who 'confide in it.'

We are 'deceivers, and yet true' because behind our preaching lies the great weight of Christian experience in all the ages.

TWENTIETH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

## Loyalty

BY THE REVEREND STUART McWILLIAM, B.D., S.T.M., ABERDEEN

'We ought to obey God rather than men.'—Ac $5^{29}$.

1. A man is beaten up, stabbed with a broken bottle and killed. A number of people are present who can testify who his assailants were. But when two men are arrested and brought to trial and these people are called as witnesses, without exception they maintain that they saw nothing, heard nothing, know nothing. A man has been brutally murdered and the people who must know how and by whom refuse to disclose what they know in a Court of Justice. This kind of thing is by no means unique. Why?

A chaplain in India attached to a hospital during the War told how in one ward there were men who had been hurt not physically but mentally by the experiences which they had undergone. Among them there was one man. He was blind and yet physically there was nothing the matter with his eyes. What had happened? He had been going through a mine field when his friend beside him exploded a mine and was badly wounded. His first instinct was to stop and help his friend, but they had had orders that they must press forward their attack whatever happened; the wounded would be cared for by others. So he went on, and then suddenly he became blind. Why?

Recently it has been disclosed that M.I.5 has asked University professors to report on the political activities and sympathies of their students. This has caused a tremendous furore. Why?

The answer in all these cases is to be found in the tensions created by a clash of loyalties. The witnesses in the murder trial, faced by a clash between their loyalty to justice, to the law of the land in which they lived, and loyalty to their friends and their social group, elected to be loyal to the latter. The soldier in hospital in India, faced by the conflict between loyalty to his friend and loyalty to military orders, rightly obeyed the latter, but the conflict was so intense that his mind was damaged by it.

The University staffs, confronted by a possible conflict between loyalty to their students and a demand which purports to command their loyalty to their country, are naturally profoundly troubled.

Our lives are compounded of many loyalties. We have our loyalties to our friends and our homes, to our employers, to our fellow-workers, to our social groups, to our professions, to our political parties, to our country, to mankind as a whole. A

man has to live with all these loyalties, but sometimes, and indeed not infrequently, they clash, and that clash always creates tensions and may lead to a physical, mental, or moral breakdown.

It can be a terrible thing this clash of loyalties. A man may steal because his loyalty to his family is stronger than his loyalty to his community. In the East, for example, one of the greatest problems of Government is the fact that a man in office is expected to find jobs for his family and relations, and what the West would regard as corruption is simply considered to be natural family loyalty.

Where there is a clash of loyalties how is one to choose? The answer most frequently given is that we must always choose the higher loyalty. But which is the higher loyalty? A Danish girl, one of the heroines of the Resistance Movement in Denmark, tells how her father was taken as a hostage, and she was told that he would be executed if she did not give herself up. She did not surrender, not because she was afraid of dying but because she was afraid that under torture she might be forced to reveal the names of other members of the resistance group to which she belonged. Her father was killed by the Nazis because of her refusal. Speaking of this after the War, she said something like this: 'What is loyalty? You talk so much about loyalty, but what do you mean by loyalty? Socrates was disloyal! The early Christians were disloyal! What is loyalty? If you could answer that question you would be able to tell me whether I saved my friends or murdered my father!' To such an agonizing dilemma can the conflict between loyalties bring men and women.

2. Is it not obvious that the only solution is to have some over-riding loyalty which is not only superior to all our other loyalties but which will include them all. Loyalty to family is not enough, because a man's loyalty to his family, if it comes first, may strike at the very heart of his loyalty to the rest of the community. Loyalty to one's social group is not enough. Loyalty to one's Trade Union, for example, may in the end mean disloyalty to the rest of one's fellow-citizens. Loyalty to country is not enough. For loyalty to one's own country may mean, as it has too often in the past meant, committing the most barbarous crimes against mankind as a whole. Loyalty to mankind as a whole is not enough. It is too large and formless a conception and open to too many widely different interpretations. One man's conception of loyalty to mankind might lead him to build hospitals for the incurably sick, but another's might lead him to build gas-chambers for them. Above and beyond loyalty to the various social groups—family, class, nation, race, mankind, there is the question of loyalty to the principles of truth, justice, humanity. If the interests of the family are at stake, has a man the right to lie in order to safeguard them? May one conspire against justice for the sake of friends? This is not an academic question. A man is arrested for being drunk in charge of a car. He has been to a dinner. How seldom do his friends who were at the dinner with him testify that he was incapable of driving his car. How often do they insist that he had had practically nothing at all to drink. If the interests of the nation are at stake, are we allowed to imprison men without trial? More searching still—if we are not permitted to kill by the law of the land, are we permitted to kill in the name of patriotism? Clearly what is required if these questions are to be answered is some over-riding loyalty which will include all these others and satisfy them. What is that loyalty to be?

3. The Communists would claim that it is loyalty to Communism. A Communist is a Communist first before he is a husband, a father, a son. He is a Communist before he is a miner, a doctor, an engineer. He is a Communist before he is a Briton, a Frenchman, and must be ready to betray his country without question so that the victory of Communism may be achieved. He has his standards of morality, but they are the standards created by Communism. Truth is what the Party says is truth. Treason is what the Party describes as treason. Justice is what the Party calls justice. Communism is the over-riding loyalty which includes all lesser loyalties. This is what the disciples of Lenin would claim. The truth, of course, is that far from including all other loyalties it destroys them. It destroys the family. It destroys friendship. It destroys truth, justice, humanity.

The only loyalty which includes all other loyalties and satisfies them all is loyalty to God. God is the supreme Good and God is Love. If you obey God you cannot be false to the principles of truth, justice, and humanity. If you obey God! There is nothing wrong with loyalty to family, friends, trade unions, country. These are good things, but without loyalty to God they become mutually destructive and this is the tragedy of our Western world—that because men have forgotten their loyalty to God they are torn apart by their lesser loyalties and likely to be destroyed by the tensions created by the conflict between these loyalties or to succumb to something like Communism which will end the tensions by destroying all the other loyalties.

You will find the text of this sermon in Ac $5^{29}$: Peter said 'we ought to obey God rather than men.' When will we learn that it is only if we obey God that we can serve men, only if we are loyal to God that we can be truly loyal to men.

REMEMBRANCE SUNDAY

## This for Remembrance

BY THE REVEREND WILLIAM BARCLAY, D.D., GLASGOW

'Know ye not that . . . ye are not your own? For ye are bought with a price.'—1 Co $6^{19.20}$.

Sometimes we hear a man claiming that he is a self-made man, and that he has come to be what he is, and where he is, by his own unaided efforts. But surely that is a claim that no man will dare to make on a day of remembrance. Tennyson in his poem makes the aged Ulysses say, as he looks back across the years: 'I am a part of all that I have met.' He saw that everything he had met in life had contributed to the making of him; and a day of remembrance compels us to think of those who have given us what we have, and who have made us what we are. It is, indeed, true that we are not our own, for we have been bought with a price. Let us, then, this day remember those to whom we owe so much.

1. Surely first on the list there must come *our parents*. In every sense we owe our lives to them. It was only at the peril of some one's life that we entered into this world at all. Of all living creatures man is born most helpless, and remains helpless longest. There were years when a blow from the hand would have killed us, and when a week's neglect would have brought life to an end. We could not have survived at all without the constant care of those who loved us. Still further, it is to godly parents that many of us owe such faith as we possess, and it was from their lips that we first heard the name of Jesus, and it was at their knees we learned to pray. We do well to-day to remember them, and to thank God for them.

2. Further, we remember this day *those to whom we owe the liberty which we enjoy*. The freedom of true democracy is not a self-producing thing; it is something which has to be won and paid for, for tyrants do not readily or willingly surrender their power. We remember Andrew Melville's words to James the Sixth in 1596: 'As divers tymes befor, sa now again, I mon tell yow, thair is twa Kings and twa kingdomes in Scotland. Thair is Chryst Jesus the King, and His kingdome the Kirk, whase subject King James the Saxt is, and of whase kingdome nocht a king nor a lord, nor a heid, but a member!' We remember Charles the First's invasion of Parliament to demand the surrender of the five members—Hampden, Pym, Hollis, Strode, and Haselrig. 'I must have them,' he said, 'wheresoever I find them.' He demanded of Speaker Lenthall where they were to be found, whereat Lenthall replied: 'I have neither eyes to see nor tongue to say save what this House commands me.' One of our greatest dangers is that we take the blessings we enjoy for granted. They did not always exist; they were bought at a price. There were those who hazarded their lives that men might walk in the knowledge of the truth and in the light of freedom. We do well this day to remember them, and to thank God for them.

3. Still further, we remember *those to whom we owe the faith which we possess*. It is the simple fact that for three hundred years to be a Christian was to be an outlaw, and to be liable to die an agonizing death. There is a grim passage in H. B. Workman's *Persecution in the Early Church*. Deliberately eschewing the horrors of the later martyrologies, and deliberately confining himself to strictly historical cases, he describes the experiences of the early martyrs: 'Some, suffering the punishment of parricides, were shut up in a sack with snakes and thrown into the sea; others were tied to huge stones and cast into a river. For Christians the Cross itself was not deemed sufficient agony; hanging on the tree, they were beaten with rods until their bowels gushed out, while vinegar and salt were rubbed into their wounds. In the Thebais, during the persecution of Diocletian, Christians were tied to catapults, and so wrenched limb from limb. Some, like Ignatius, were thrown to the beasts; others tied to their horns. Women were stripped, enclosed in nets, and exposed to the attacks of furious bulls. Many were made to lie on sharp shells and tortured with scrapers, claws, and pincers, before being delivered to the mercy of the flames. Not a few were broken on the wheel, or torn in pieces by wild horses. Of some the feet were slowly burned away, cold water being poured over them the while lest the victims should expire too rapidly.' It may be that our refined susceptibilities are offended by a passage like that, and we shrink from reading it, or from quoting it; but the simple fact is that unless there had been thousands of men and women who were prepared to face such tortures, we would not be Christian people to-day. Throughout the ages there were those who chose to suffer and to die rather than to deny their Master's name. We do well to-day to remember them, and to thank God for them.

4. We remember to-day *those who died in war*, those who placed their bodies a living wall between their country and her enemies. Whatever be our views of war, such a sacrifice cannot be lightly forgotten. A man may believe in pacifism without refusing to recognize heroism. And here there is a change; for in this matter we are not amidst the great names which scintillate in the pages of the books of history; we are amongst the nameless

host of ordinary men and women. In the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews the writer of that Letter rolls out his long list of his country's roll of honour ; and then in the thirty-sixth verse there are two words—*and others*. After the great names there comes the army of nameless ones. And to-day we remember those whose names are not written in history, but who, without romance and glamour and heroics, went out to the four corners of the earth and the seven seas and the trackless air in defence of the things and of the people whom they loved. Some never came back ; some came back to a life which could never be the same again ; and for some of those who were left life ever since has been a lonelier and an emptier road. We do well to-day to remember them, and to thank God for them.

5. And to-day we remember the greatest sacrifice of all, *the sacrifice of Jesus Christ upon the Cross*. He, too, died for men, and He, too, laid down His life that others might live. Abraham Lincoln, the liberator of the slaves, fell by the assassin's bullet. His funeral was passing through the crowded streets ; amongst the crowds there was an old negro woman, and with her a little boy. As the cortege passed, the old woman turned to the little boy, who could not yet understand, but who might one day remember, and said to him through her tears : 'Take a good look at him—he died for you.' So to-day above and beyond all the others we remember Jesus Christ who suffered and died for us. We do well to-day to remember Him, and to thank God for Him.

6. 'Ye are bought with a great price.' We are always in danger of taking the greatest things for granted. We are always in danger of being so busy living that we forget what the privilege of living cost. We are always in danger of being in so great a hurry that we have no time to stop and to remember the past and to think of the future. But to-day is designed to bring us out of the noise into the silence, that we may remember.

On such a day no thinking man can avoid two feelings. The one is a feeling of humble gratitude for all those who in every age and generation lived and died to make him what he is, and to give him what he possesses, for no precious thing in this world was ever won without some one's blood and sweat and tears. The other is a feeling of responsibility. No man dare waste a thing which cost a price beyond all reckoning, and no man can lightly enter into a great heritage, and fail to pass it on still greater.

Therefore, on such a day as this memory must waken with gratitude and kindle dedication. We are bought with a great price ; and this day we remember with gratitude those who paid that price, and we dedicate ourselves to the task of being worthy of the sacrifices of men and the supreme sacrifice of God.

---

TWENTY-SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

## The Queen of Sheba

BY THE REVEREND JOHN R. GRAY, V.R.D., B.D., GLASGOW

'The queen of Sheba heard of the fame of Solomon concerning the name of the Lord . . . when the queen of Sheba had seen all Solomon's wisdom . . . she gave the king an hundred and twenty talents of gold, and of spices very great store, and precious stones : there came no more such abundance of spices as these which the queen of Sheba gave to king Solomon.'—1 K $10^{1.4.10}$.

The Queen of Sheba heard. . . . And when she had seen. . . . She gave.

The Yemen, where our troops were recently in action, is inhabited by one of the most barbarous tribes in the world. It is, moreover, one of the hottest, driest, most infertile regions there is. Not everybody may know what it was called in Bible times. It was Sheba.

What an extraordinary woman the Queen of Sheba must have been to rule over those savage tribes in that war-like age, and to rule with such confidence that she could leave them for months to pay a State visit to Jerusalem ! She seems, moreover, to have been an exceptionally good economist. Out of this barren country she came with a very great company, with camels that bore spices and very much gold and precious stones. If you look at the map and trace the route from Aden to Jerusalem you will see that it covers over a thousand miles of the cruellest country in the world. I doubt if any of us would relish making such a journey to-day even with the help of radio, radar, jeeps, and sand tractors. It must have taken a deal of sheer physical courage and endurance for a woman three thousand years ago, who probably travelled the whole way swaying and bumping on a camel !

Let us look briefly at the three things the texts tell us about the Queen of Sheba. (1) She heard. (2) She came and saw. (3) She gave.

1. She heard. No doubt every ruler of that time had heard of Solomon, the great Pharaoh's son-in-law. The fame of the Temple he had built and the news of his naval and military prowess had spread far and wide. His gift of twenty cities to Hiram, King of Tyre, had been a sensation. Every one knew of his magnificence. But notice what the Queen of Sheba had heard of his fame. It was not about his building programme nor his military

might nor his wealth she heard. These things evidently didn't interest her greatly. She heard of the fame of Solomon *concerning the name of the Lord*.

There was a hunger in the Queen of Sheba's heart for the knowledge of God. She heard news of God because she was listening for it. Men complain nowadays that there is an absence of an authentic word about God. Part of the trouble may be with the preaching of the Word. But part of the trouble is that people will not listen. We come to church sometimes, but we plan Monday's wash or Tuesday's party or play last Saturday's golf again, and if the sermon goes on for more than twenty minutes we lose patience. We will spend three hours at the cinema, an hour and a half at a game of football, but allow twenty minutes for the Word of God—and no more. Let a nation beware that has more time for a game than a sermon.

If the thing is important at all, it is all important. It is foolish to spend so much of our time on the means of life and so pitifully little on its ends. 'Seek ye first the kingdom of God,' Christ said, 'seek and ye shall find.' The kingdom of God is not like something lying at the roadside which can be casually picked up. It is 'a pearl of great price.' It is 'a treasure hid in a field.' In seeking it you must take time and have patience and not grudge trouble or shrink from concentration—otherwise you are less civilized than the Queen of Sheba. She knew that finally this was all that mattered—to know God. In this she was like Augustine who prayed, 'Give me of Thyself, without which, though Thou shouldst give me all else that ever Thou hadst made, yet could not I be satisfied.'

(2) But the Queen of Sheba was not satisfied with a carried story, with a second-hand faith. She had no sooner heard of the fame of Solomon concerning the name of the Lord than she determined to make the long journey to see him. When she came to him 'she tried him with hard questions and communed with him of all that was in her heart.' 'And when the queen of Sheba had seen all Solomon's wisdom' she said: 'It was a true report that I heard in mine own land. . . . Howbeit I believed not the words until I came, and mine eyes had seen it; and, behold, the half was not told me: thy wisdom and prosperity exceedeth the fame that I heard.'

There is such a thing as a healthy scepticism. We should not throttle the questions in our hearts. We should bring them out into the open in the certainty that the nearer we get to the truth, the nearer we will get to God. 'The faith of our fathers' is no mortal use unless it be also our very own. Faith is a personal thing, a personal relationship to the living God through Christ. Into this personal relationship no man can enter for us, neither father nor mother, preacher nor friend. I cannot claim to know President Eisenhower because I know a man who knows a man who knows him. I could only claim to know him if I had met him face to face. We cannot claim to know Christ until we know Him for ourselves, have met Him face to face.

The Queen of Sheba heard. Not satisfied she came. And when she had seen—she gave.

(3) She did not go away unchanged. She was moved and impressed and instructed, and so—she gave—and how she gave! Six tons of gold, £40,000 of precious stones, she gave—not as a bribe nor as a price, but simply as a gift to a wise man. We don't have the grace of giving like this any more. We exchange a few presents at Christmas costing within shillings of the same price. At marriages we say, 'Now what did they give to our Mary? I'm sure it did not cost more than £3. What can I get for £2?' Contrast that with Jacob's gifts to Esau or Isaac's gifts to Rachel or the alabaster box of ointment or the gift of the widow who cast in all she had. Yet, you know, there is a curious sense of release when we make an uncalled for, extravagant gift. It comes from the detachment of ourselves from the weight and bondage of material things.

We have heard of a greater than Solomon, not just one who knows but one who is the truth of God—God's word made flesh. In some sort we have all seen Him and must remember, have known Him and cannot quite forget. At Communion time or as we stood at an open grave we have known that He was near and been at peace. But we cannot let it rest at that—not at least if we have seen the cost of our peace. We have heard of the Cross, and sometimes we have seen it. If that be so, in any sort be so, we must give.

When I survey the wondrous Cross
On which the Prince of Glory died,
My richest gain I count but loss,
And pour contempt on all my pride.

Were the whole realm of Nature mine,
That were an offering far too small;
Love so amazing, so divine,
Demands my soul, my life, my all.

Knowing that I must fail, I must yet try to match His giving of Himself. A life I have received. A life I owe. I cannot offer less or I shall be far out-topped in generosity by this half-savage Queen of the long ago, who, when she heard of the fame of Solomon concerning the name of the Lord and had seen all Solomon's wisdom, right royally gave.

# Contributions and Comments

## The Disciples and the Zealots

In the ' Notes of Recent Exposition ' in the June issue of The Expository Times [lxviii. 257], an account was given of Professor Oscar Cullmann's recent book *The State in the New Testament*. The writer pointed out the importance and relevance of the theme, and indicated a number of interesting suggestions made in this book by way of its elucidation. There can be no doubt that in this, as in several other of his works, Dr. Cullmann has thrown a good deal of fresh light on the subject, and given a valuable stimulus to further study.

At the same time, it is a little surprising not to find in your comments any indication of the extremely conjectural nature of some of the interpretations offered by Professor Cullmann. In some cases he acknowledges his indebtedness to that very erratic scholar, the late Robert Eisler, whose work came under such heavy fire years ago.

Thus, for instance, Dr. Cullmann follows Eisler in the opinion that the expression ' Bar-Jonah ' as applied to Simon Peter in Mt $16^{17}$ probably means ' the terrorist ' rather than ' son of John ' (though the latter interpretation is implied in Jn $1^{42}$ and $21^{15}$).[1]

Eisler's effort[2] in this connexion to replace a patronymic (which has several parallels in the New Testament itself in various other ' bar- ' formations) by a much more obscure title, derived ultimately from an Accadian word, is but one example of his many strained and artificial interpretations. It is not surprising that it was severely criticized by a number of leading scholars. Thus, Maurice Goguel, in his *Jésus et le Messianisme Politique : Examen de la théorie de M. Robert Eisler* [1930], summed up his discussion of Eisler's argument on this point in this way : ' *Tout cela constitue un échafaudage d'hypothèses arbitraires et parfaitement inutiles, puisque la tradition évangélique et le sens naturel des mots fournissent du terme* Barjona *une explication entièrement plausible et tout à fait naturelle* ' (p. 40).

(Incidentally, I recently acquired a copy of this monograph which Goguel presented to Eisler. It contains a somewhat menacing dedication ' *Amicus Eisler, magis amica veritas,*' though the blow is softened a little by the addition : ' *Par vérité j'entends non la vérité en elle-même mais la vérité telle qu'elle m'apparait* '!)

J. W. Jack, in 1933, published a more extensive refutation of Eisler's work in his *The Historic Christ*.[3] He devotes several pages to a discussion of ' Simon Barjona ' [pp. 187–191], and, like Goguel, decisively rejects Eisler's interpretation. He argues that ' Jona ' is simply a contraction of *Ἰωάνης* and gives evidence for its use as such in the Septuagint.[4] He continues : ' It is evident, therefore, that *Ἰωνᾶ* the second syllable of the compound, is another form of *Ἰωάνου* (John), and that the designation " Barjona " has nothing to do with the extremists or anti-Roman agitators, but must be translated " son of John " ' (p. 189). The whole section should be referred to, for fuller details and further points which we cannot include here.

It is little wonder that Dr. John Lowe, in his recent study entitled *Saint Peter*, after briefly mentioning Eisler's view of Bar-Jonah should comment : ' But this singular theory has not found favour ; the great majority of scholars is content to accept the interpretation of John $1^{42}$ that it is simply " son of John " ' (p. 3).

It should be noted, too, that the suggested Zealot affinities of some of the other disciples, as mentioned by Cullmann, are open to question. Even Luke's ' Simon the Zealot ' is ambiguous ; some scholars, like A. T. Olmstead,[5] consider that it refers to religious zeal rather than party affiliation. The same writer also prefers to take ' Iscariot ' in a local sense, rather than as an equivalent for ' *sicarius* ' (which again is a dubious conjecture). It is strange, if there were three Zealots among the disciples, that they should all be given different titles to indicate the same standpoint !

D. R. Griffiths

*University College, Cardiff*

---

[1] *The State in the New Testament*, 16, 17 ; cf. the author's *Peter, Disciple—Apostle—Martyr*, 21, 22, where it is said that the ' terrorist ' interpretation ' must remain doubtful.'

[2] *The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist*, pages 252, 253 in particular.

[3] *The Historic Christ* (An Examination of Dr. Robert Eisler's Theory according to the Slavonic Version of Josephus and the Other Sources).

[4] Cf. also T. W. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus*, 204. Manson comments : ' The Semitic form of John is Jochanan. It is possible that Jonah is an abbreviation of Jochanan. There is no clear proof of this (Dalman, *Gram.*[2], 179, n. 5) ; but Jona appears as a variant in MSS. of the Septuagint, where the Hebrew has Jochanan. The exact form of the name of Peter's father must remain doubtful.'

[5] A. T. Olmstead, *Jesus in the Light of History*, 111, 112.

## A Note on Matthew xxii. 12

καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ Ἑταῖρε, πῶς εἰσῆλθες ὧδε μὴ ἔχων ἔνδυμα γάμου ; ὁ δὲ ἐφιμώθη. τότε ὁ βασιλεὺς εἶπεν τοῖς διακόνοις Δήσαντες αὐτοῦ πόδας καὶ χεῖρας.

Professor T. W. Manson (*The Sayings of Jesus*, 226) comments on the guest without a wedding garment: 'One is tempted to surmise that the one man of the parable is meant for some one person—a Judas, or (if party feeling ran high enough) a Paul?' The following points are suggested in support of the former interpretation.

(1) The word διάκονος rather than δοῦλος is uncommon in the Gospels, and is generally used to refer to the disciples. (This is always so in the Synoptics: the only exception in John is its application to the servants at the marriage at Cana [$2^{5.9}$].) See Mt $20^{26}$, Mk $10^{43}$, Mt $23^{11}$, Mk $9^{35}$, Jn $12^{26}$.

(2) The words διάκονος and διακονία early acquired a more precise meaning, and διακονία is used of the ministry of Judas to which Matthias succeeds (Ac $1^{17.25}$).

(3) The word ἑταῖρος is strangely unknown in the New Testament except in Matthew, where it occurs three or possibly four times. While this form of address (cf. the English 'My dear sir') may be used in kindly reproach, its use here is surely surprising, in view of the succeeding verse, in which the servants are told to bind him hand and foot and cast him out into outer darkness. For this reason the reading of D, old Latin, old Syriac and Irenaeus, 'Take him up by the hands and feet,' is a little easier, for the allusion to Gehenna is less clear. We can appreciate, too, the omission of ἑταῖρε in Origen. However, is it possibly more than a coincidence that the same form of address is used by Matthew (and by him alone) for Jesus' greeting to Judas at His arrest ($26^{50}$)?

(4) Matthew alone of the Synoptics applies the solemn imprecation of the traitor by name to Judas (Mt $26^{25}$; cf. Mk $14^{21}$, Lk $22^{23}$ and Jn $13^{26}$), and Matthew alone of the Gospels includes his subsequent fate ($27^{3-10}$).

(5) The concluding logion, 'Many are called, but few chosen' acquires further point in the context of Judas' treachery.

(6) It would surely be surprising if the treachery of one of the chosen Twelve had no repercussions on the development of Gospel tradition. The possibility must be considered that Matthew here intends by the guest consigned to outer darkness a veiled reference to Judas, who is described in Jn $17^{12}$ as the 'son of perdition,' and who in John's account was dismissed from the Last Supper ($13^{27}$), and 'went out straightway: and it was night' ($13^{30}$).

K. R. J. Cripps
*Manchester*

## The Term Nšq in Genesis xli. 40

The Rev. Norman Adcock's suggestion (The Expository Times, lxvii. [September 1956] 383) that נשק in Gn $41^{40}$ reflects an Egyptian idiom 'to kiss one's food,' *i.e.*, 'to eat,' was anticipated by the late A. S. Yahuda in his *Language of the Pentateuch in its Relation to Egyptian*, i. [1933] 7 f.

The presence of נשק in this verse has frequently aroused comment; but the idiom invoked by Yahuda and Adcock in explanation is not really satisfactory. The Egyptian verb *sn* 'to kiss' is well known, but its idiomatic use in the expression 'to kiss food' is derived and limited. Further, the expression means 'to taste' rather than 'to eat' and (unlike the Hebrew here) the direct object must be stated.[1]

Nevertheless Yahuda and Mr. Adcock are doubtless right in looking for an Egyptian idiom. There exists another and very common use of the verb *sn*, 'kiss,' which fits Gn $41^{40}$ perfectly. This is the expression *sn-t3*, literally 'kiss the earth,' meaning 'to render homage or allegiance.'[2] This idiom is well attested and the object need not be stated. It might well be translated by נשק, and *v.* 40 would then run: 'according to thy command(s) shall all my people kiss' (*sc.* the earth, in submission), and express the authority vested in Joseph.

The expression *sn-t3* carries something of the force of προσκυνέω (so Erman-Grapow, iv. 154) and of ὑπακούω which the LXX uses to render נשק here. In Brown, Driver and Briggs, *Lexicon*,[3] reference is made to the Arabic cognate *nasaqa*, 'arrange in order,' thus obtaining a meaning like the 'be ruled,' 'order themselves,' or 'do homage' of the A.V., R.V., R.V.m., and A.R.S.V. However neither this *pis aller* nor emendation is needful; the renderings of the English versions are correct, but are probably now to be justified on surer grounds than originally influenced the translators.

Furthermore, is it so certain that the context favours the rendering 'to feed' as Mr. Adcock suggests? The whole context has reference to Joseph's authority, not his duties. Joseph is to rule over Pharaoh's house and Pharaoh's people must obey his word—in short, Joseph is supreme over both Palace and Plebs. The only qualification is Pharaoh's supremacy in regal function. Verses 41–45 accord fully with this in alluding to Joseph's investiture with full authority at Court and in public. Verses 45 ff. show us that authority in action.

K. A. Kitchen
*School of Archaeology and Oriental Studies, University of Liverpool*

[1] Cf. Erman-Grapow, *Wörterbuch der Aegyptischen Sprache*, iv. [1930] 154, ref. 1.

[2] Erman-Grapow, *op. cit.*, 154, refs. 9–24, esp. 13, with examples in the *Belegstellen*, iv.

[3] P. 676, *s.v.* i. נשק.

# Entre Nous

### Being with God

A man may possess something of infinite potential value, but he may fail to get anything like the best out of it because he does not know how to use it in the right way. There are many people who are in that position with prayer; and any book which helps us to pray aright is rendering an incalculable service to us.

We have before us three little books on prayer, each of which has something of value to say.

*Conversation with God: Learning to Pray*, by the Rev. H. A. Hamilton, B.A. (Religious Education Press; 2s. 6d. net), had a most practical origin. Mr. Hamilton was formerly Principal of Westhill Training College, Birmingham. Young people came to Westhill College to be trained for a Christian vocation. They had but little training in prayer. Many of them came to doubt that they had any right to 'teach religion' because they themselves did not know how to walk and talk with God so that life became a conversation with Him. To meet this situation Mr. Hamilton arranged that on one morning each week there should be no College prayers, but that the students should be alone for a quarter of an hour in their rooms. To help them he gave them printed sheets of suggestions which might offer 'possible journeys for the mind to take, until God is encountered on the road.' This book is a selection of these suggestions. It is simple and direct and challenging. 'If we want to know, to be still and know, we must hold one thought long enough to bring us to quiet. Think then of this: "Your Heavenly Father knoweth what things you need." That is the kind of God who is waiting for you to return His gaze and to take what He offers. Then hold up to Him: Your failures and follies, Your day's duties, Your loved ones, Any special need.' This book indeed teaches to pray.

*Some Prayers Jesus Prayed*, by the Rev. W. W. Simpson, M.A. (Independent Press; 1s. 3d.), consists of a series of short talks given for the B.B.C. on each day for a week. This is a most unusual book. It deals with the *Shema*, the *Ahabah*, the *Eighteen Benedictions*, the *Prayer for the Kindling of the Lights*, and the prayer in memory of parents called the *Mourner's Prayer*. These are all prayers taken from the Jewish prayer-book; and they all go back to the time of Jesus, who must Himself have used and loved them. This is real scholarship turned to real devotion.

*About Prayer*, by the Rev. David N. Francis (Epworth Press; 6s. net), must be one of the most practically helpful books about prayer ever written. Prayer is not *talking to God*; it is *talking with God*; for prayer is 'not a monologue but a relationship.' Better still, prayer is 'being with God.'

There are many inadequate ways to pray. Prayer is not a grim *duty*, which must be gone through to avert the Divine anger. Prayer is not a *fetish*, a charm to enable us to do things. Prayer is not a *tonic*, a kind of 'spiritual Sanatogen' like a magic potion. Prayer is not only for the *crisis*, 'a kind of fire-station or first-aid centre to which we rush in sudden or desperate need, but safely ignore otherwise.' Prayer is not a way of *getting what we want*, a kind of private line to a General Stores. Prayer is not a *lever* for moving and waking God to do things which otherwise He would not have done. 'When we pray aright we shall be concerned that things be done not so much *for* us as *to* us.' The Prodigal Son began by saying, 'Give me,' but he ended by saying, 'Make me.'

Confession requires particular care. It is foolish to enter into a kind of competition of self-denigration. It generally is not true; and it is not real humility:

> Once in a saintly passion
> I cried with desperate grief,
> 'O Lord, my heart is black with guilt,
> Of sinners I am chief.'
> Then stooped my guardian angel,
> And whispered from behind,
> 'Vanity, my little man!
> You're nothing of the kind.'

A cold douche like that will save a man from employing a vocabulary of confession which may be orthodox but which is certainly meaningless. Further, confession must be detailed. There is a certain famous advertisement which says: 'Don't be vague.' That is excellent advice for the confession of our sins to God.

Mr. Francis has an excellent chapter on so-called 'unanswered prayer.' There are six questions which we must ask ourselves. (1) Are we praying *aright*? Can we really pray 'in His name'? Do we sometimes ask God to be untrue to Himself, and to make us special favourites, even at the expense of others, like the mother who prays that her son may be first in an examination, and so gain a success which he may not deserve? (2) Are we sure God *needs* to answer? Are we praying for

things which, if we honestly tried, we could effect ourselves? A petition is often unavailing, because the answer is in our own hands. (3) Do we believe God is able to answer? 'So often we do not expect God to answer; and sometimes we secretly doubt whether He can.' (4) Do we sufficiently *want* God to answer? Many of our prayers are still-born because they are fundamentally insincere. The things we pray for are no doubt the right things, but they are not the things we really want. (5) Are we sure that God is not *already* answering? God may say: 'Yes.' God often says: 'Wait.' And sometimes God says: 'No.' There was a time when God said to Moses: 'Speak no more to me on this matter.' (6) Are we sure God is *free* to answer? We are all members one of another. We may pray for some one, and that some one may be using his or her free-will to resist the answering action of God. God cannot and does not coerce people. 'So it is that often God would answer us, but He is waiting for some one else.'

It is something to have written a book which makes a man better able to pray. The size of a book is no indication of its value, and in this little book Mr. Francis is teaching us to pray—and what could be more valuable than that?

WILLIAM BARCLAY

---

**'All is of God'**

'It is often said by Protestants, in opposition to the "*ex opere operato*" doctrine, that the efficacy of the sacraments depends on the faith of the recipient. But is that quite a safe way of putting it? Does not that suggest that the human part comes first, is prevenient? Would that not be to forget that "all is of God," that even the faith by which we accept God's grace is itself a gift of God, that it is wrought in us by His grace, and partly *by means of* the sacraments?

'Thus instead of saying that sacraments depend on human faith, it is better to say that sacraments *operate through* human faith. And in order to explicate what that means, I should like to use a very simple and homely illustration.

'Let us imagine the case of a small child, a little boy, entrusted to the care of a nursery governess. When she arrives, the little fellow is taken into the room where she is, and left in her care. But she is strange to him, he does not trust her, but looks distantly at this strange woman from the opposite side of the room. She knows that she cannot do anything with him until she has won his confidence. She knows she has to *win* it. The little boy cannot manufacture it, cannot make himself trust the governess. His faith in her is something which he cannot create—only *she* can create it. And she knows that she cannot create it by forcing it; she has to respect the personality of the child; and to try to take the citadel by storm would be worse than useless, and would produce fear and distrust instead of confidence.

'She sets herself about her task gently, using various means—words, gestures, and smiles, and perhaps gifts, all of which convey something of the kindness of her heart. Until at last the little fellow's mistrust is melted away, she has won his confidence, and of his own free will he responds to her advances and crosses the floor to sit on her knee. Now that her graciousness, using all these means, has created his faith, she can carry on the good work she has begun.

'No human analogy is anything like adequate to the relation between God and man. But since we are all but as little children in the things of God, and He is our Father, I believe this simple analogy can illuminate some very old problems. We cannot create our faith in God, we cannot make ourselves trust in Him. Our faith must be His gift, His work. . . . He bestows on us the gift of faith, by winning us, gaining our confidence, not forcing it. His graciousness overcomes our mistrust, His grace creates our faith, so that when we come to Him, it is really *our* faith, and we come willingly. In order to bring about this end He uses means—words, smiles, gestures, symbolic gifts, which we call sacraments.'[1]

[1] D. M. Baillie, *The Theology of the Sacraments*, 53–54.

---

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.